

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

AD PLUTARCHI DE PYTHIAE ORACULIS.

C. 2, pag. 395B. DIOGENIANUS peculiarem aeris colorem magnopere admirans, causam eius rei quaerit: τὸν μὲν γὰρ Κορίνθιον οὐ τέχνη <φασιν> ἀλλὰ συντυχία τῆς χροᾶς λαβεῖν τὸ κάλλος ἐπιειμαμένον πυρὸς οἰκίαν ἔχουσάν τι χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου, πλείστον δὲ χαλκὸν ἀποκείμενον· ὃν συγχυθέντων καὶ συντακέντων ὄνομα τὸν χαλκὸν (Paton; codd. τοῦ χαλκοῦ) τῷ μείζονι τὸ πλήθος παρασχέιν (Paton; codd. παρέσχεν).

φασίν Bernadacis et Paton suppleverunt. Collatis tamen quae sequuntur: ἄλλον λόγον ἡμεῖς ἀκηκόαμεν πανοῦργεστερον et paulo infra: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα κικεύνα μῦθος ἔστιν potius exspectes μυθολογοῦσιν vel simile quid.

In posteriore sententiae parte pro τῷ μείζονι τὸ πλήθος Stegmann proposuit τὸ μείζον πλήθος, Hartman, *Mnem.* 1913, p. 355: τοῦ χαλκοῦ <τῷ παντὶ> τὸ μείζον πλήθος; uterque codicum scripturam τοῦ χαλκοῦ . . . παρέσχεν retinuit. Mihi vero in vocabulis τῷ μείζονι latere videtur τῷ μείζον εἶναι, ut Plutarchus scripserit: ὄνομα τὸν χαλκὸν τῷ μείζον εἶναι τὸ πλήθος παρασχέιν: aes, quod maior esset eius copia, metallis illis commixtis nomen dedisse.

C. 3, pag. 395F. φησὶ τοῖνον (sc. Aris-toteles) τὸν μὲν ἄλλων ὑγρῶν ἐπιόντα διέχευ ἀδήλως καὶ διασπείρεσθαι τὸν ἰόν, ἀνωμάτων . . . καὶ μανῶν ὄντων· τοῦ δὲ ἐλαίου τῇ πυκνότητι στέγχεσθαι καὶ διαμένειν ὑθροϊζόμενον.

Reiske lacunam 8 litterarum post

ἀνωμάτων supplevit τὸν πόρον, minus recte, ut opinor. Oleum enim in eo differt a ceteris liquoribus, quod *particulae* eius aequaliores sunt, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.*, pag. 696B: οὐ γὰρ ἔχει (sc. τὸ ἐλαιον) μεταξύ τῶν ξηρῶν καὶ γεωδῶν ἐν αὐτῷ μερῶν κενώματα καὶ πόρους, *ibid.*, pag. 702B: ὅθεν οὐδὲ τῷ ἀέρι δίδωσιν ἀνάμειξιν (sc. τὸ ἐλαιον), ἀλλ' ἀποστατεῖ διὰ λεπτότητα τῶν μορίων καὶ συνέχειαν, ὥστε κ.τ.λ. Itaque suppleatur τὸν μορίων vel τὸν μερῶν.

C. 4, pag. 396B. Diogenianus ad peculiarem aeris colorem explicandum non opus esse contendit et crassitudine aeris Delphici et tenuitate: alteram utram satis esse: ἡ γὰρ λεπτότης, ἔφη, δόξει μὲν ὑπεναντιοῦσθαι [καὶ] πρὸς τὴν λεγομένην πυκνότητα τοῦ αἵρος, λαμβάνεται δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαίως· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ (Abresch, *diss. Leid.*, 1878, pag. 9; codd. ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ) παλαιούμενος ὁ χαλκὸς ἀποπνεῖ καὶ μεθήσει τὸν ἰόν, ὃν ἡ πυκνότης συνέχουσα καὶ παχνοῦσα ποιεῖ ἐκφανῆ διὰ πλήθος.

Paton jure offensus in hiatu ποιεῖ ἐκφανῆ, minus recte proposuit ποιεῖ <πάλιν> ἐκφανῆ. Leniore medicina usus lege καταφανῆ.

C. 7, pag. 397B. ἡμεῖς δὲ, ὦ Βόηθε, κὰν ἢ φαυλότερα τῶν Ὀμήρου ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη, μὴ νομίζωμεν αὐτὰ πεποιηκέναι τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.

Post φαυλότερα Wyttenbach supplevit κὰν βελτίονα, Paton κὰν κομψότερα. Neutrum mihi placet, praesertim cum lacunam libri MSS. nullam indicent.

Lenius Bernadacis $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta$ < $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta$ μὴ η >. Ego, quo magis lectionem traditam sequar, conjecerim $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta$ <μὴ> η .

Paulo infra legendum censeo: $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta$ γὰρ εἰ γράφειν ἔδει μὴ<δὲ> λέγειν <αὐτὰς> τοὺς χρησμούς. . . καλλιγραφία (Abresch, diss. Leid. pag. 41; codd. καλλιγραφία). Voce αὐτὰς denotantur dei ministrae, προφήτιδες, quarum paulo supra mentio facta est.

C. 7, pag. 397C. δῆλος γὰρ εἰ (ὦ Βόηθε) καὶ αὐτὸς ὑποφερόμενος.

Vocabula καὶ αὐτὸς corrupta sunt. Ex iis enim, qui huic dialogo intersunt, nemo ad Epicureorum praecepta inclinat vel eius sectae fautor est. Itaque lege πρὸς αὐτούς. De καὶ et πρὸς inter se confusis, cf. Cobet, *Var. Lectt.*, pag. 272.

C. 7, pag. 397D. Diogenianus cur Pythia, quae tunc esset, pedestri oratione oracula ederet, quaerens, οὐδείς γὰρ, inquit, ἔστιν Ἑλλήνων, ὃς οὐκ αἰτίαν ἐπιζητεῖ καὶ λόγον πῶς πέπνυται τὸ μαντεῖον ἔπεσι καὶ ἐλέγοις (Madvig, *Adv. Crit.* I. pag. 636; codd. λόγοις) χρώμενον.

Ἑλλήνων Bernadacis et Paton ediderunt recepta Stegmanni conjectura. Reiske, item Abresch, quem Reiskii correctio fugisse videtur, pro codicum scriptura (ἀλλήλων E, ἄλλων B) proposuerunt ἀνθρώπων, quod quanto Stegmanni conjecturae praestet, nemo non videbit.

C. 9, pag. 398E. ταυτὶ δὲ τὰ πρόσφατα καὶ νέα πάθη περὶ τε Κύμην καὶ Δικαιάρχειαν οὐχ ὑμνούμενα πάλαι καὶ ἀδόμητα διὰ τῶν Σιβυλλείων ὁ χρόνος ὥσπερ ὀφείλων ἀποδέδωκεν, ἐκρήξεις πυρὸς ὀρείου καὶ ζέσεις θαλασσίας καὶ πετρῶν καὶ φλεγμονῶν ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀναρρίψεις κ.τ.λ.

Quid sint φλεγμονῶν ἀναρρίψεις haud facile quis expediat. φλεγμὴν enim, quod vocabulum medicinae artis proprium est, valet inflammationem, metaphorice perturbationem. Suspicio Plutarchum scripsisse: πετρῶν καταφλεγόμενων ἀναρρίψεις, quibuscum verbis conferas Plin. *Epist.* vi. 16: Tum navibus cinis incidebat . . . iam pumices etiam nigrique et ambusti et fracti igne lapides.

C. 10, pag. 399A. Σίβυλλαι δ' αὐταὶ καὶ Βάκιδες ὥσπερ εἰς πόντον ἀτεκμάρτως τὸν χρόνον κατέβαλον καὶ διέσπειραν, ὥς

ἔτυχε, παντοδαπῶν ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα παθῶν καὶ συμπτωμάτων· οἷς γηγρομένων ἐνίων ἀπὸ τύχης ὁμοίως ψευδός ἐστι τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\eta$ (Leon, codd. καὶ) ὑστερον ἀληθές (Emper, codd. ἀληθώς) εἰ τύχοι, γέννηται.

Posteriorem huius sententiae partem vitio laborare multi viderunt neque tamen apposite emendaverunt. Legatur: ὧν γενομένων (codd. γινομένων) ἐνίων . . . ὁμῶς ψευδός, vel cum Reiskio ψευδές: e quibus, quamquam nonnulla forte fortuna evenerunt, tamen mendacium (vel falsum) est, quidquid nunc praedicatur, etiamsi postea verum esse probatur.

C. 11, pag. 399E. οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι τινα ἐρεῖν ὅτι μετὰ τούτων ὥς προερρήθη συνέπεσε κατὰ τύχην.

Pro μετὰ τούτων ὥς Paton in textum recepit τὰ μέτρα ταῦτα ὥς, quae viri doctissimi conjectura minime mihi placet. In proximis enim nulla mentio facta est de numeris atque rythmis oraculorum; verum, cum Serapio id agat ut exemplis quam maximis Boetho probet oracula non fortuito evenire, sed re vera futura praedicere, minime dubito quin Plutarchus scripserit: ὅτι μὲν ταῦτα (i.e. res priore capitis parte memoratae) οὕτως ὥς προερρήθη συνέπεσε κατὰ τύχην.

C. 12, pag. 400A. εἰπόντος δὲ τοῦ Σεραπίωνος ὅτι τὴν ἐξ ὑγρῶν ἠνίξατο τροφὴν τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ γένεσιν καὶ ἀναθυμίασιν ὁ δημιουργός, εἴτε κ.τ.λ.

Vox ἀναθυμίασις, exhalatio, vapores emissi, vix sana est. In promptu est corrigere ἐξ ἀναθυμιάσεως collatis quae apud Plutarchum leguntur de *Stoic. Rep.* pag. 1053A, nisi quis offensus in verborum ordine legere mavult καὶ ἀναψιν, ut paulo infra: ὑποβάλλεις ἄτρεμα τῷ λόγῳ τὰς ἀνάψεις καὶ ἀναθυμιάσεις.

C. 12, pag. 400D. Lege: ἔγωγε, εἶπον (codd. Bernad., Paton: εἶπεν) ὥς τοῦ ἡλίου τὴν σελήνην. Philini enim sunt verba, qui Basilocli refert quae cum Diogeniano hospite amici disputaverint. Paulo infra, c. 13, pag. 400D, cum Kurtzio, *B. Rh. W.*, 1894, pag. 1125, legendum censeo: ἀπορία δὲ αἰτίας, ἐμοὶ γοῦν δοκεῖN, σιωπῶντων ἐκείνων κ.τ.λ.

C. 16, pag. 401F. (λέγεται) τὸν Κροῖσον . . . τῷ θεῷ τὴν χάριν ἀμείψασθαι τῇ γυναικὶ, εὐ γὰρ ποιοῦντα ἐκείνον, ὅθεν,

εἶπεν, ἄξιον δὴ κ.τ.λ. Pro ὅθεν lege ὁ Θέων et verba εὖ γε ποιούντα a prae-
cedentibus disjunge, quod Wyttenbach
iam monuit.

C. 19, pag. 403F. Theopompus qui
aequalibus comprobare vult, sua quo-
que aetate oracula numeris composita
Pythiam edere παντάπασιν ὀλίγων
χρησμάτων ὑπόρηκεν, ὡς τῶν ἄλλων
καὶ τότε καταλογάδην ἐκφερομένων.

Pro τῶν ἄλλων, quod minus recte
opponatur vocabulo ὀλίγων, recte resti-
tuit v. Herwerden, Plut. et Luc., pag. 15
τῶν πολλῶν.

C. 20, pag. 403F. Ἔνιοι (sc. χρησμοί)
δὲ καὶ νῦν μετὰ μέτρων ἐκτρέχουσιν, ὧν
ἕνεκα καὶ πρᾶγμα περιβόητον πεποίη-
κεν.

Pro verbis ὧν ἕνεκα καὶ Paton scripsit
ὧν ἓνα ἢ κακία παράγουσα, ingeniosius,
mea quidem sententia, quam verius;
Wyttenbach conjecit ὧν ἓνα καὶ πρᾶγμα,
quem Bernadacis secutus proposuit ὧν
ἓνα καὶ τι πρᾶγμα. Mihi vero in KAKAI
latere videtur KAINONTI, et noster
scripsisse ὧν ἓνα καινόν τι πρᾶγμα, ut
sensus sit: *c quibus unum (oraculum)*
res admodum nova notissimum reddidit,
quae sententia optime iis quae sequ-
untur convenit.

C. 27, pag. 407F. Ἰστε (Reiske, codd.
εἰς) γὰρ τὸν Χίον . . . ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς
ἡγεμόνας στολῶν ὅσοις ἔδει τεκμηρίους
ἀνευρεῖν τήν . . . ἰδρυσιν ὧν ἔνιοι καὶ

δημάρτανον, ὥσπερ Βάττος. ἔλεξε γὰρ
ἐκπεσεῖν οὐ καταλαβὼν ἐφ' ὃν ἐπέμφθη
τόπον· εἴτα ἤκε δεύτερον ποτνιώμενος.

Vocabulum ἔλεξε corruptum esse
nemo non vidit. Quod autem Reiske
proposuit ἔδοξε, id, quamquam artis
palaeographicae rationibus optime de-
fenditur, minus tamen sententiae con-
venit, quod ipse vidit vir doctissimus,
quippe qui ἐκπεσεῖν in ἐψεύσθαι vel
ἐξηπατήσθαι mutandum censuerit.
Neque quae Paton conjecit mihi pla-
cent. Fortiore quadam medicina usus,
lege ἔλπιδος γὰρ ἐξέπεσεν: *spe enim dejec-*
tus est. Id certe optime congruit cum
Batti casibus quibus in enarrandis Plu-
tarchus maxima e parte Cyrenaeos
secutus est, cf. Herod. iv. 154-157.

C. 29, pag. 408F. ἡ δὲ τῆς Πυθίας
διᾶλεκτος . . . εὐθεία πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν
οὖσα, πρὸς δὲ πίστιν ἐπισφαλῆς καὶ
ὑπεύθυνος οὐδένα καθ' αὐτῆς ἐλεγχον
ἄχρι νῦν παράδωκεν. Nil opus est
Madvigii conjectura, *Adv. Crit.*, I. pag.
637, ἀνεπισφαλῆς. Sensus loci, quem
supra laudavi, hic est: Pythiae sermo,
etsi facile *fidem*, quam homines in eo
ponunt, *amittere* potest, semperque
rationi reddendae obnoxius est, nullam
tamen usque ad hoc tempus facultatem
sui accusandi dedit.

J. H. W. STRIJD.

Amersfoort, Holland.

A FEW NOTES ON THE TEXT OF MARCUS AURELIUS.

I. 5. IT is not known whom
Marcus meant by τροφῆως. Possibly
the name has dropped out. He is
generally identified with the educator
mentioned in Capit. *Vit. Pii* x. § 5:
'Cum Marcus mortuum educatorem
suum fleret vocareturque ab aulicis
ministris ab ostentatione pietatis, ipse
dixerit, "Permittite," inquit, "illi ut
homo sit; neque enim vel philosophia
vel imperium tollit adfectus." If the
identification is correct, the τροφῆως of
Marcus must have died about 139. But
it has not been noticed that Aristides
in his funeral oration over Alexander
of Cotiaeum (Jebb § 148) says of him:
γενόμενος τοῖνυν ἐπ' ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως

τοσαύτης ὥστε καὶ τροφῆως χώραν οὐχὶ
διδασκάλου μόνον τῶν παιδῶν (i.e. Marcus
and Lucius) ἔχειν. We know from
Aristides that he was at Rome in 145
and residing at the Palace. But as he
is the Alexander the Grammarian men-
tioned I. 10 it does not seem likely that
he was meant by τροφῆως.

III. 16, § 2 τὰ λοιπὰ κοινά. The word
λοιπά comes awkwardly with λοιπὸν fol-
lowing so soon, and τοιαῦτα would seem
a possible substitution. In the preceding
lines certain persons are ambiguously re-
ferred to as 'disbelievers in Gods, traitors
to their country and doers (of unname-
able deeds) when the doors are shut.'
Marcus sums them up in the curious

neuter τὰ εἰρημένα. The three stock charges against the Christians were that they were atheists, men without patriotism, and guilty of incest and cannibalism. It is impossible not to believe that they are referred to here. If so, the accepted view of the attitude of this Emperor towards the Christians must be revised, for he admits that such persons, as are alluded to, τὸν νοῦν ἡγέμενα ἔχουσι ἐπὶ τὰ φαινόμενα καθήκοντα. Compare again VII. 28, where he speaks of those 'who can live out their lives in the utmost peace of mind, even though all the world cry out against them what they choose, and the beasts tear them limb-meal.' He cannot be thinking of ordinary criminals, for the persons mentioned are obviously innocent people wrongfully ill-treated. Again VIII. 51, he quotes the indignant cry of whom but the Christians?—They kill us, they cut us limb from limb, they execrate us—adding: 'How does that prevent you from being pure, sane, sober, just?' But, we shall be told, in XI. 3, he distinctly mentions the Christians with disapproval. No doubt he is there glancing at the Christians, but nevertheless the words ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ must I think, be a gloss. They are quite ungrammatical, and have the precise form that a marginal note would take. Moreover the word παράταξις, persistently translated 'obstinacy,' according to the usage of Marcus and of Lucian¹ means 'opposition,' not 'obstinacy.' Very instructive is another passage, if, as I think quite possible, Marcus has the Christians in his eye: Μέμνησο ὅτι ἀκαταμάχητον γίνεται τὸ ἡγεμονικόν ὅταν εἰς ἑαυτὸ συστραφέν ἀρκεσθῇ ἑαυτῷ, μὴ ποιοῦν τι ὃ μὴ θέλει, κἀν ἀλόγως παρατάξῃται. Such opposition does not meet with his entire disapproval. In fact conduct such as that of the martyrs is exactly what Marcus is never tired of commending—not under any compulsion to transgress the demands of the ruling Reason, and if it be found impossible to act up to the standard of right set by the conscience owing to external things, then to depart cheerfully from life. This was a cardinal

doctrine of the Stoic creed. What Marcus does disapprove of is the Christian habit of rushing on death (as he deemed it) without due consideration or dignity and too theatrically. Another reason for thinking the word Χριστιανοὶ a gloss is that the term was a barbarism, and as such tabu with the literary purists, of whom Marcus was undoubtedly one. It is eschewed by Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Aristides, Galen, Apuleius, Dio Cassius and Philostratus, even where they are apparently speaking of Christians. Lucian uses the word in his *Alexander* and *Peregrinus*, if those pieces are by him.

IV. 3 § 3. τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν δοκούντων. This, the reading of the MSS., is corrected by Gataker to τῶν εὐφημεῖν δοκούντων. It is worth while suggesting τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν or τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν <εὐφημεῖν>.

IV. 33. Here, in the citation of Roman heroes, Δέντατος for Λεοννάτος (Wyse) has won wide acceptance. Why not also Ουαλέριος for Ουόλεσος, seeing that Volesus was the Sabine ancestor of the Valerii?

V. 6 § 2. εὖ ποιήσας. The following ἔτερον suggests the possibility of ἔν having fallen out before εὖ, whereas in X. 8 § 3 ἔν γε τοῦτο would read better as εὖ γε τοῦτο.

V. 12 ad fin. χέση. A reference to the rather disgusting story in Diog. Laert. *Diog.* § 6 (repeated in *Arist.* § 4) might seem to suggest πτύση as a possible emendation for χέση.

V. 36. διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν. Perhaps διὰ τούτους gives more point to the taunt.

V. 36. ἐπεὶ τοι γίνῃ. This passage is given up by Stich and Schenkl, and a satisfactory emendation seems hopeless. But ἔπειτα τί seems likely for ἐπεὶ τοι.

VI. 16 § 4. ἐπὶ τί (or τί P.) σπεύδουσιν. Couat has suggested τοῦτο, but τουτὶ accounts better for the MS. reading. I think this form is found once in Marcus, and has been introduced into the text of V. 3 by Radermacher, and of VIII. 44 by Leopold.

VII. 24. ὅταν πολλάκις ἐναποθνήσκῃ ἢ τὸ πρόσχημα. Schenkl abandons this passage as beyond cure. As an attempt to patch it up, I would suggest ὃ ὅταν

¹ Marcus III. 3; VIII. 48. Lucian *Quom. Histor.*, §§ 45, 49.

πολλάκις ἐνῇ, ἀποθνήσκει δὲ (ἤδη) τὸ πρόσχημα.

VIII. 31. εἶτα ἐπιθι τὰς ἄλλας. Schenkl would understand αὐλὰς, and marks a lacuna, a favourite resource of his. Could τὸν ὅλης φυλῆς stand, with Lofft's μηκέθ' ἑνός to follow?

VIII. 41 *ad fin.* ἄπτεται, ὅταν γένηται σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὲς μένει. Rendall suggests μονίη (cp. XII. 3), and there is justice in his objection to the pointlessness of the received reading; but the words make a senarius if we substitute σφαῖρα (cp. VIII. 20, XI. 12) for σφαῖρος, and μενεῖ for μένει will perhaps slightly improve the sense. To obviate the want of a connecting particle after ὅταν, a dash must be placed after ἄπτεται.

XI. 21. ἐνεργείας ἀπόληξις, ὁρμῆς, ἰπολήψεως παῦλα. Richards suggests the loss of a substantive after ὁρμῆς, and the symmetry of the sentence appears to require it. Would ἀπόληψις answer the purpose?

IX. 30 *ad fin.* τὸ σύμπαν. Is this not rather too sweeping a negative? If so, τοιοῦτον may be the true reading.

XI. 11. εἰ μὲν οὐκ. Read εἰ μὲν οὐν <μή>.

XI. 18 *ad fin.* ἀσθενούς (ἀσθενεῖ A). A comparison with XI. 9 would suggest ἀσθενές = 'a weak thing,' a 'weakness.'

XI. 20. πνευμάτιον. Why not πνευματικόν, as in IV. 4?

XI. 26. τῶν Ἐφεσίων. Schenkl does not admit Gataker's drastic emendation Ἐπικουρείων (cp. Sen. *Ep.* XI. 8). Could Ἐφέσιοι mean the followers of Heraclitus? Or would τοῦ Ἐφεσίου stand as a designation of that philosopher?

XI. 34. οὐδὲν δύσφημον, ἔφη, ἀλλά. For ἀλλὰ we might recall ὄνομα from Epictetus III. 24. 88.

XII. 2. καθαρμάτων. This word is out of keeping with ἀγγείων and φλοιῶν. Perhaps καλυμμάτων.

XII. 36. πέντε ἔτεσιν <ἢ τρισί>. The two last words are added by Reiske, but would not εἰκόσιν be more likely to fall out after ἔτεσιν?

C. R. HAINES.

Mazagon, Godalming.

SOME NOTES ON THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Hymn to Apollo, 402.

τῶν δ' οὐτις κατὰ θυμὸν ἐπεφράσατο νοῆσαι.

SUCH is the reading of M. For οὐτις the whole of the remaining MSS. have ὅς τις, and for ἐπεφράσατο, D has ἐπεφράσσατο, the χ family ἐπιφράσσατο, the ρ family ἐπιφράσσαιτο. Allen-Sikes adopt the readings ὅς τις . . . ἐπιφράσσαιτο, which 'can mean "whoever thought to observe the dolphin."' The sense, however, is not very good: it is not obvious why Apollo (the dolphin) should resent inspection, though in view of the lacuna which probably follows this must not be pressed. But the reading of ρ looks like a correction of the metre rather than a genuine reading, and this suspicion is strengthened by the combined readings of M, D, and the rest of χ . Is it not likely that, details apart, the indicative was read in the

common ancestor of our MSS.? Then, of course, correction is needed. I suggest that the original reading was, οὐ τις . . . ἐπεφράσαθ' ὥστε νοῆσαι, meaning, roughly: 'no thought occurred to anyone leading him to recognise (the dolphin as Apollo).' This seems at least better sense. The trouble probably arose in an uncial MS.

Hymn to Hermes, 41.

ἔνθ' ἀναπηλῆσας γλυφάνφ πολιοῖο σιδήρον αἰδῶν' ἐξετόρησεν.

ἀναπηλῆσας seems to defy explanation successfully: it is retained in the Oxford text (= *cum convertisset*), but this rendering is probably a guess, since the sense of the participle (see Allen-Sikes' note) is so uncertain. Of the conjectures Barnes' ἀναπηδήσας is graphically the simplest, but is stultified by the previous

line: Hermann's ἀναπηλίσσας—as the editors very justly remark—is quite inapplicable to a tortoise.

Does not αἰῶνα in l. 42 limit the range of meaning of the participle? It clearly means marrow, pulp; and this could hardly be used of a complete tortoise. Therefore ἀναπηλίσσας (or whatever word it conceals) should indicate some action which renders the tortoise a mere mass of pulp or jelly. I suggest ἀναπηρώσας should be read. This gives excellent sense: Hermes first maims the tortoise (cutting off its head and feet), and then scoops out the shapeless mass left in the shell. Graphically, perhaps the supposed corruption, ρω into λη, is not very easy, unless we can assume that both letters were very hastily written, which would make a mistake possible.

The only other use of ἀναπηρώω I can find is in Plato, *Polit.* 310 E.

Hymn to Hermes, 188.

ἔνθα γέροντα

κνώδαλον εὔρε νέμοντα παρέξ ὁδοῦ, ἔρκος ἀλωῆς.

κνώδαλον is not in the least likely to be a corruption, and doubtless means 'his ox or his ass' (Allen-Sikes); νέμοντα seems to be adequately covered by κνώδαλον. But ἔρκος ἀλωῆς very naturally defies explanation. It cannot be in opposition to κνώδαλον in imitation of the Homeric ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν: only a watch-dog could reasonably be so called, since a vineyard cannot be ploughed. A very simple correction will put the matter straight if we read παρ' ἐξοδον ἔρκεος αὐλῆς. There is no reason for the old man to be still in his vineyard: rather, it being early morning, he might reasonably be found near his house 'grazing his beast along the way which led out from his courtyard.' The corruption of ἔρκεος αὐλῆς to ἔρκος ἀλωῆς might easily result from memory of the ending of l. 87.

Hymn to Hermes, 346.

αὐτὸς οὗτος ὅδ' ἐκτός, ἀμήχανος.

Correction is obviously necessary. The Oxford text accepts Bothe's ὁ δεκτός, which is explained by Allen-Sikes

as 'receptive, sc. thievish (as δέκτης of a beggar, δ. 248).' That δεκτός does not otherwise occur until the period of N.T. Greek is not in itself to be taken too seriously, but it is an important objection that in the N.T. δεκτός has its root meaning, accepted, acceptable. To call Hermes 'receptive' is weak and most inappropriate to the brisk narrative of the passage.

Possibly the order has been affected, following on some slight corruption: one might think of the true reading as being:

αὐτὸς δ' ἐκτός ὁδοῦ, τις ἀμήχανος.

If so, the corruption must have arisen in the passing from uncial to minuscule script. The minuscule scribe finding before him the group ΑΤΤΟCΔΕΚΤΟCΟΔΟΤΤΙC might easily fall into a trap and read αὐτὸς δ' ἐκτός ὁδ' οὗτος; and he or a successor would seek to smooth over the difficulty as far as possible by changing the order to that of the MSS.

The only objection seems to be that Hermes has not been walking outside the path—his sandals being sufficient disguise. There may be an immaterial misstatement on the part of Apollo; or can ἐκτός ὁδοῦ mean 'without walking in the usual way'? The sequel οὗτ' ἄρα ποσσίν, etc., rather suggests this.

For τις ἀμήχανος cp. ρ 499, τις θαρσαλέος.

Hymn to Hestia (xxiv.), 4.

ἐπέρχεο θυμὸν ἔχουσα.

If the MSS. are right a lacuna is necessary, but such an assumption is objectionable in so short a hymn. Tucker's neat alteration ἐν' ἔρχεο is accepted in the Oxford text; but it is perhaps a pity to sacrifice the intensive ἐπέρχεο. May not θυμὸν ἔχουσα be a corruption of θῦμα λαχοῦσα = πῖαρ ἐλουσα (*Aphrodite*, 30)?

Hymn to Hestia (xxix.) 8 ff. Allen-Sikes mark a lacuna after line 9; there is, of course, no real objection to *valere* following *συ*, as the editors remark. But, even with a lacuna after line 9, the transition back to the singular, ἵλαος ὢν, seems intolerable. That the order of the lines has been disturbed seems

almost certain, and Martin placed l. 9 after l. 11. To this change, however, there are serious objections which are remarked by the editors, notably the asyndeton of the clause *ἔργματα*, and the connection of *δῶματα* with *ἀνθρώπων*. It seems preferable to put l. 9 after l. 10, with a full stop at the end of l. 10, changing *Ἔστιν* to *εἰδότες* in l. 11. *Ἔστιν* may have been substituted because *εἰδότες* occurred in the same position in l. 12.

There is no palæographic explanation of the apparent inversion of ll. 9-10

(unless l. 10 was first omitted, then added in the margin of a MS., and, finally, wrongly placed by a copyist too mechanical to think of the sense of what he was writing); yet even so pure accidents do happen, even in copying MSS.

If this arrangement is right, Groddeck's view that the occasion of the hymn was the dedication of a joint temple of Hermes and Hestia seems more definitely established.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

AITNAIOI KANΘΑΠΟΙ.

EVERYONE remembers the Aetnaean beetle on which Trygaeus mounted to Olympus, but it is not so generally realized that it is also a source of mystification. The Alexandrians had carefully collected parallels from Epicharmus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Plato Comicus in order to explain the allusion; and though we ought to congratulate ourselves on the good fortune of their preservation, we may suspect that they have actually confused the issue. Let us see what the interpreters have to say, starting from the scholia. There are three alternatives: (1) A big beetle, because Aetna was a big mountain. This is almost a literal paraphrase of Plato's joke (fr. 37, I. 610 K.): *ὡς μέγα μέντοι πάνυ τὴν Αἴτνην ὄρος εἶναι φασὶ τεκμαίρου | ἐνθα τρέφεσθαι τὰς κανθαρίδας τῶν ἀνθρώπων λόγος ἐστὶν | οὐδὲν ἐλάττους* ('Judge how big Aetna must be, where they tell us the beetles are as big as men'). 'Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat!' And yet it is adopted by Blaydes in sober earnest. (2) Aetnaean, because a peculiar kind of (large) beetle is found there. The fact is established by the evidence of natives (Epicharmus), or of one who was as good as a native (Aeschylus). Sophocles and Plato show that they were big. We will leave this for the moment and pass to (3): Aetnaean, because Aetnaean (Sicilian) horses were a famous breed. For the last-mentioned fact, which is

notorious, the scholiast quotes Pind. fr. 102. Now this is a learned note, worthy of all respect, although after successive redactions, it perhaps bears a different aspect than when first composed by Didymus. But I imagine that, if the situation in the *Pax* were considered without any of the prejudice imported from the scholia, no one would hesitate to plump for the third view. 'My master has put in the stable an Arabian-beetle.'¹ Yet Van Leeuwen and Mr. Graves are alone in taking this course at all hazards. Dr. Rogers is very decisively on the other side: 'The passages which they [the scholl.] cite . . . are conclusive in favour of the third [our second] interpretation' [*i.e.* 'that there was in fact some species of large beetle called the Aetnaean, probably from being found in the neighbourhood of that mountain']. Dr. Merry and Mr. Sharpley are inclined to hedge, apparently agreeing with the view expressed by Jebb on *O.C.* 312: 'In *Ar. Pax* 73 the *Αἰτναῖος μέγιστος κανθαρος* is not a mere joke on the Etna breed of horses, but alludes to a species of beetle actually found there.' These critics have not observed that zoological accuracy would have blunted the none too keen edge of the witticism. It was reserved for O. Crusius, in one of his masterly notes on the *Paroemio-*

¹ So Mr. Sharpley. But the joke is impossible in English, as will appear.

graphi (*Philol. suppl.* vi. 291 f.), to show that Aristophanes did not invent the joke, but inherited it from Epicharmus (fr. 76 K.): <ὁ> Πυγμαρίων λοχαγὸς ἐκ τῶν κανθάρων | τῶν μεζόνων, οὓς φαντι τὰν Αἴτναν ἔχειν. The occasion described was the attack of the Pygmies on the sleeping Heracles (*Philostr. imag.* 2. 22), — a scene which exactly corresponds with Gulliver's earliest adventure in Lilliput; and the leader of the Pygmies had just leapt from his war-chariot drawn by the big beetles that Aetna was said to rear. But I am surprised that Crusius did not draw the inference that the Αἰτναῖος κανθαρος is altogether a fabulous beast, the figment of Epicharmus' (or some other's) brain. For the starting point of the combination is simply the verbal similarity of *κάνθων* (*κανθήλιος*) to *κάνθαρος*, an instance of γέλως ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως κατὰ παρωνυμίαν (*Kaibel, Com.* I. p. 51, Starkie's *Acharnians*, p. xlix, Rutherford, *Annotation*, p. 442). The point is driven home in Aristophanes by the grooming of the beetle, which is addressed as *κάνθων*—a quasi-hypocoristic—by its master. Cf. Greg. *Cypr. Cod. Mosq.* 2. 24 Αἰτναῖον *κάνθωνα* τὸν μέγαν. Henceforward, Αἰτναῖος *κάνθαρος* becomes part of the comedian's stock-in-trade, a ludicrous image apt to describe any fantastic, grotesque, and unfamiliar object. Aeschylus, in his satyric *Σίουφος πετροκυλιστής* (fr. 233), was perhaps the first to give currency at Athens to the Sicilian extravagance. Sisyphus, straining at his penal task, every limb extended against the weight of the rock, what is he but a huge Aetnaean beetle crawling up the mountain? ¹ Sophocles, in his satyric *Daedalus* (fr. 165), where metre suggests that we should read ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ *κάνθαρος* | τῶν Αἰτναίων <γε> πάντως, presents a more enigmatic picture. But I believe that he was referring to the brazen giant Talos (λέγει δὲ πάντως εἰκάζων εἰς μέγαν, says the scholiast),

that masterpiece of Hephaestus' cunning, constructed with a single tube of life running from neck to ankle, whom Minos employed as a sentinel to exclude strangers from Crete. 'Well, he certainly isn't a beetle, not even an Aetnaean one. . . .' It is surely significant that all the four passages quoted to illustrate the *Pax* are also of a comic character; significant again, if every traveller knew of these beetles, that Plato should think it worth while to say that they were reported to be bigger than men; significant above all that the Sicilian Epicharmus should attribute their existence to hearsay.

Quite recently Oxyrhynchus has yielded another example, again from a satyric drama (*Soph. Ichneut.* 300), which, as I venture to think, entirely confirms our results. After several futile attempts by the satyrs to guess Cyllene's riddle concerning the beast which found a voice after death, they suggest the *κεράστης* *κάνθαρος* Αἰτναῖος. 'Now you're almost exactly right,' replies Cyllene. Guessing can go no further; they have certainly succeeded in naming no less amazing a *τέρας*. The dialogue moves towards a climax of inept perplexity. The satyrs ask in one breath: 'Is he like a weasel or a leopard?' Then: 'Is he like a dog² or a crab?' No wonder that, when they come to the horned Aetnaean beetle, Cyllene gravely assures them they are right. As to *κεράστης*, I suppose it to be simply an added extravagance. A beast which spoke after death might be as dangerous to encounter as the *κεράστης* ὄφις of the Libyan desert.

Whether the scarabaeus, which appears on a coin of Aetna beneath a head of Silenus (*B.V. Head, Hist. Num.* ² p. 131), has so much significance as has been claimed for it, is a question for numismatists to decide. But they should not be hampered by a false impression of the literary evidence.

A. C. PEARSON.

¹ I follow Hermann in making fr. 227 interrogative: ἀλλ' ἀρουραῖος τίς ἐστί σμίνθος ὦδ' ὑπερφνής; Here is the answer: <πῶς λέγεις;> Αἰτναῖος ἐστί κανθαρος βίᾳ πονῶν.

² *Ichneutē* (298), conjectured by Zielinski, is now acknowledged by Professor Hunt to be the reading of the papyrus.

THE PANATHENAIC SHIP OF HERODES ATTICUS.

(Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum*, II. v.)

PHILOSTRATUS, in describing the benefactions of Herodes Atticus to Athens, mentions his splendid celebration of the Panathenaic Games, when he fulfilled his promise of receiving the spectators in the Stadium with marble seats; the author then goes on to describe the route of the Panathenaic Ship, which bore the Peplos of Athena as its sail, and was moved by invisible mechanical power, as follows:

δραμεῖν δὲ τὴν ναῦν, οὐχ ὑποζυγίων
ἀγόντων ἀλλ' ὑπγείοις μηχαναῖς ἐπο-
λισθάνουσανο, ἐκ Κεραμεικοῦ δὲ ἀρα-
σαν . . . ἀφεῖναι ἐπὶ τὸ Ἐλευσίνιον,
καὶ περιβάλλουσιν αὐτὸ παραμείψαι τὸ
Πελασγικὸν κομιζομένην δὲ παρὰ τὸ
Πύθιον ἐλθεῖν οἱ νῦν ὤρμισται· τὸ δὲ
ἐπὶ θάτερα τοῦ Σταδίου νεῶς ἐπέχει τύχης
καὶ ἀγαλμα ἐλεφάντινον.

The passage has usually been taken apart from its context, and quoted as evidence that this Panathenaic ship stood beside the Pythion: and the further inference has been drawn that by Pythion here must be meant, not the Pythion beside the Ilissus, but another Pythion close under the Acropolis, because Pausanias saw a Panathenaic ship beside the Areopagus. There is indeed no evidence that the two ships were identical; it is perhaps more probable that they were not, since it appears from this passage that it was the usual custom to carry the Peplos on a ship drawn by beasts; and that of Herodes was evidently of a special construction. But, quite apart from this question, the whole theory rests upon a mistranslation of Philostratus; this mistranslation has been emphasized by placing a comma after ἐλθεῖν; it runs thus: 'it passed the Pelasgikon, and then arrived in its course at the Pythion, where it now is anchored,' οἱ instead of οὗ being presumably explained by a sort of attraction. But, if we omit the comma, or place it after Πύθιον, the correct translation becomes obvious—'it was carried past the Pythion, and arrived at the place where

it now is anchored.' Where this place was the following words show—'and the other side of the Stadium is occupied by a temple of Fortune with an ivory statue.'

The whole context now becomes clear. It is a description of the monuments which Athens owed to Herodes; and Philostratus, who lived some time in Athens, must have been familiar with them. The chief thing was the magnificent Stadium with its marble seats. On one side of it was the temple of Fortune, also doubtless built by him, and on the other his wonderful Panathenaic ship. We know that his tomb was also in the same region. The route by which the ship was brought there is also clear. It started with the rest of the Panathenaic procession from the Ceramicus, rounded the Eleusinion, of which the site is still, unfortunately, uncertain, and so reached the Pelasgikon at the entrance of the Acropolis. Here doubtless the Peplos was removed from the ship and carried up to the Acropolis; it was impossible to take such a complicated and unwieldy structure any further up the hill. The ship was then taken past the Pythion on the Ilissus, and so to its place beside the Stadium, to be preserved there among the other monuments of Herodes' public-spirited munificence. It will be noticed that the Pythion is mentioned, like the Eleusinion and the Pelasgikon, merely as one of the things passed by the ship in its transit.

If the ship was identical with the one seen by Pausanias, we must suppose that it had not yet been moved to its position beside the Stadium at the time of Pausanias' visit to Athens. If so, we should have to admit that Philostratus is mistaken in his description of the route of the Panathenaic procession on this occasion. But his evidence as to the route of a procession, which took place nearly a hundred years before his time, does not evidently carry the same authority as his statement as to the position of a conspicuous object such

as this ship in the Athens of his own days.

The Philostratus passage has long been a puzzle to Athenian topographers, some of whom have given it up as an insoluble problem. But, with the straightforward translation now given, the difficulties disappear. I may add

that I have submitted the passage to my colleague, Professor Platt, merely as a question of language, and apart from any topographical considerations; and he assures me that, in his opinion, my translation is the only possible one.

ERNEST A. GARDNER.

LEGIONS AND AUXILIA.

It used to be said that, in the army of the Roman Empire, *auxilia* were attached to the various legions in more or less equal numbers and in more or less definite fashion. More recent writers seem to speak somewhat doubtfully or even to leave the matter unnoticed. It may be well to try to sum the main facts for readers of this *Review*. The conclusion to which I incline is, that legions and *auxilia* were connected, but not so individually as the old view supposed.

Proofs of some connection can be found in classical literature. Besides vague passages, such as Suet. *Tib.* 16 or Tac. *Ann.* iv. 5. 5, which, though often quoted, are ineffective, we have the well-known case of the *octo Batavorum cohortes, quartae decumae legionis auxilia* in A.D. 68, Tac. *Hist.* i. 59. These cohorts had apparently been sent with Legio XIV from Britain to a destination not precisely stated, but had got separated on the way, *discordia temporum*.¹ Besides this familiar instance, we have such evidence as the following: (1) *Hist.* i. 64 suggests a connection between the Legio I Italica and the Gaulish Ala Tauriana. (2) *Ann.* xiii. 35 records the transference to the East from Germania of an unnamed *legio cum equitibus alariis et peditatu cohortium* in A.D. 58—a good precedent for a trans-

ference in A.D. 68. (3) Several passages connect legions and *auxilia* significantly, e.g. *Hist.* i. 57, 79 (*tertia legio adiunctis auxiliis*), ii. 4, iv. 62, *Ann.* xii. 29, etc. It may be noted that these passages mention both cohorts and *alae*. If here and still more in the next paragraph cohorts are the more often named, that is because the Roman army included twice or three times as many cohorts as *alae*, not because (as one scholar has thought) the arrangement applied only to the former.

Five inscriptions give similar testimony. (1) One, from the later first century, a dedication to Hercules Saxanus, is set up by vexillaries of Legio XXI Rapax *et auxilia eorum, cohortes v.* (Dessau, 9120). (2) A second, of about A.D. 158, mentions the African Legio III Augusta *et auxilia eius* (D. 342). A third, from the Danubian wars of Marcus (about A.D. 170), alludes to the legions I Italica and IV Flavia *cum omnibus copiis auxiliorum* (D. 1111, cf. Domaszewski, *Neue Heidelberger Jahrb.* v. 117). A fourth, from Bonn, was put up by the Leg. I Minervia *cum auxiliis* in A.D. 231 (*CIL.* xiii. 8,017). The fifth, of about twenty years later, records vexillations of British and German legions *cum auxiliis earum* (D. 546). I do not know other examples of this turn of phrase, but it clearly is akin to those indicated in the preceding paragraph.

On the other hand, many facts show that the tie between legions and *auxilia* was not very close. *Auxilia* served in provinces where no legions were stationed. Where the two served together, there is no sign of any fixed numerical ratio. Agricola thought that

¹ The legion got as far as Dalmatia, and was perhaps on its way to the East. The assertion of M. Meyer (*Philologus*, xlvii. 660) that it has left tiles with its stamp in Dalmatia is wrong, and indeed very careless; the examples which he quotes are inscriptions on stone, most of which are plainly of much later date. No tile of Leg. XIV Gemina has been ever found in Dalmatia (see *CIL.* III. 13339 = 14023).

Ireland could be conquered and held *legione una et modicis auxiliis*, and the mere epithet shows that the number of auxiliaries might vary. Nor again is there any sign of tactical connection in the battle-order. One has only to contrast the arrangement outlined in *Hist.* ii. 24 with the more usual tactics of *Agr.* 35 or *Hist.* v. 16 to see that the relationship between a legion and its *auxilia* did not extend into the battle-line. Even administratively, the *auxilia* could be grouped apart; thus in A.D. 74 commanders of senatorial rank appear as *praefecti auxiliorum adversus Germanos* (D. 990, 991). Nor, lastly, was there any connection in permanent encampments. In not a few legionary fortresses the inscriptions give no hint of any beyond the smallest body of auxiliaries as stationed within the ramparts. At the most an *ala* occurs, as possibly at Novaesium—though Nissen's proof of that does not convince me—and at Delminium in Dalmatia (inland from Spalato), where the *ala nova Claudia* was seemingly quartered with the Seventh Legion in the first century. Among the many military inscriptions of our English Chester, only one can with any shred of probability be attributed to an auxiliary (my Catalogue, 66; compare the sculpture 137). To some extent the absence of 'auxiliary' tombstones may be due to the fact that the *auxilia* were less well paid and less well off than the legionaries. But it seems

plain that legionary fortresses housed, as a rule, few or no auxiliaries.

The explanation of these diverse evidences may best be found if we start from the undoubted fact, that the normal field-force in the Roman Empire was composed of legionary heavy infantry, supplemented by the various kinds of troops serving in the *auxilia*. So, too, the fortified posts of a fully garrisoned province were divided into the large legionary *hiberna* and the more numerous auxiliary *castella*. Tacitus, indeed, uses the phrase *legiones et auxilia* as a rhetorical alternative to *exercitus*, just as he puts *cohortes alaeque* for *auxilia* or *municipia et coloniae* for the Italian towns. The combination of the different kinds of troops was practically necessary for the various kinds of fighting and garrisoning, and it was thus needful—under normal conditions—to provide *auxilia* wherever legionaries went. Particularly, when a legion moved to new quarters, it had to take *auxilia* with it, unless (one may suppose) they were otherwise provided. But it does not seem that individual regiments were attached permanently. The connection was rather which exists in a modern army between foot and horse and guns. The normal army corps must have all three, but, save for convenience at mobilisation, there is no special tie between any particular battery and any particular squadrons of cavalry.

F. HAVERFIELD.

NOTES

THE ENCLITIC FORMS OF 'ΕΓΩ AND ΣΥ WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO JOHN XX. 17, AND ACTS XXVI. 28.

THE enclitic forms of ἐγώ and σύ are particularly common when the so-called ethical dative is involved. It is not necessary to multiply examples. Everyone knows such familiar instances as Demosth. 910.28 καὶ μοι ἀνάγνωθι τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν παραγενομένων, 918.29 καὶ μοι ἀνάγνωθι τούτων τὰς μαρτυρίας, where μοι may be represented by 'if

you please.' Perhaps, however, it has not always been observed that the enclitic, in such cases, comes early with surprising frequency, and is attached to such unimportant words as καί, ἀλλά, μή, and the like. For instance, Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 493 ὃν δὴ . . . δέδουκ' ἐγώ—μή μοι βεβήκη, i.e. 'lest I may find him gone.'

But, unless I mistake, very few have observed that the dative is a mere accident of the particular construction: exactly the same effect is obtained by other cases of the enclitic. Take Plato,

Phaedo 117A, Ch. 66. ἕως ἂν σου βάρος ἐν τοῖς σκέλεσι γένηται, i.e. 'until you find your legs heavy.' Here σου performs the function of an ethical dative, but as the enclitic ultimately belongs to σκέλεσι it is put in the genitive case.

Exactly similar is μὲν in Anacreon's lyric beginning μεσονυκτίοις ποθ' ὥραις at ll. 8 and 9. 'Τίς', ἔφην, 'θύρας ἀράσσει—κατὰ μὲν σχίσας οὐνείρους;' = 'breaking, if you please, into my dreams.'

A good example is John xx. 17, μὴ μου ἄπτου, where μου is practically μοι, but the dative becomes genitive under the influence of ἄπτου, and the sense is almost certainly: 'Nay, I prithee, cling no longer.'

Thus the two noticeable features are that (1) an enclitic form is usually employed with the 'ethical' dative or with the equivalent, in sense, of an 'ethical' dative; (2) the enclitic comes early in the sentence, and may be attached to words of no great importance, the enclitic belonging primarily to the whole sentence and only secondarily to some particular word.

Ignorance of these facts has, I fancy, produced the famous confusion of readings at Acts 26, 28. I believe the original reading to have been: ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθει χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. Here με is just like the μου of John xx. 17. It begins by being 'ethical,' i.e. = 'if you please, forsooth,' and it ends in being governed by ποιῆσαι. Thus, literally, the words may be translated: 'With small trouble, forsooth (με), you fancy that you have made me a Christian.'

The copyist of B and Aleph quite instinctively wrote πείθεις to govern με, and later scribes, as was inevitable, changed ποιῆσαι to γενέσθαι in order to make sense.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

The University, Adelaide.

NOTE ON PLATO: PHAEDO, p. 105a.

ὅρα δὴ εἰ οὕτως ὀρίξῃ . . . ἐκεῖνο ὃ ἂν ἐπιφέρῃ τι ἐναντίον ἐκείνῳ, ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἴῃ, μηδέποτε δέξασθαι.

It is with an anxiety approaching dismay that I, a layman as regards philosophy, find myself compelled to

differ from Professor Burnet in the interpretation of this vexed passage. But I make a practice of trying to unravel the difficulties of the classics for myself; and the process by which I attempt to arrive at an understanding, from which, at any rate, I have derived most assistance, is the simple process of weighing carefully the language that surrounds the passage in question. Professor Burnet, of course, has done that in the present passage: he has done a great deal more for the interpretation of it that I could not have done. But I cannot think that he has applied the linguistic test, if I may so call it, successfully.

At p. 104d, Socrates has said that things which, though not enemies to another thing, yet do not await its attack, but either perish or 'withdraw,' are those which compel 'that which they occupy' (i.e., in the original illustration, Socrates, as 'occupied by' συμκρότης; in the more complicated, a number as 'occupied' by the Triad) to contain their (or perhaps, its own) form, and, invariably, something besides, that is enemy to another Thing. The occupied position is referred to as ὅτι in the words ὅτι ἂν κατάσχη. Presently he says that this other Form—we are not concerned here with the confusion between Things and Forms that seems, at least to me, to vitiate the whole of the argument with which the *Phaedo* closes—can never gain access to the position, ἐπὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον οὐδέποτε ἂν ἔλθοι (I presume he means, so long as the enemy is safely inside—but this point is not worked out). Passing over our passage for a moment, we finally discover that the 'position' occupied is the σῶμα, the occupying Thing is the ψυχή, and it 'comes to that position'—ἡκεῖ ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο ὅτι ἂν κατάσχη—bringing ζωή.

Now in the words ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἴῃ of our passage, I do not see how αὐτὸ can apply to anything but the Thing in occupation of the position. The attacking Thing, we have been told, οὐδέποτε ἂν ἔλθοι ἐπὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον (the position). When Professor Burnet tells us that ἐπιέναι is used invariably of that which attacks, he surely does not mean to include in this statement ἰέναι ἐπὶ. Else

how does he account for ἡκει ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο (=the position = σῶμα), said of the ψυχή? It is equally certain that ἐφ' ὅτι is the position occupied, the σῶμα. There is one really awkward point in the language. Is ἐκεῖνο antecedent of ἐφ' ὅτι? Two passages bear on this point: and the first of them inclines one to answer, with confidence, No; but the other equally strongly suggests the answer, Yes. I mean, of course (1) τὸ γὰρ ἐναντίον αἰὲ αὐτῷ ἐπιφέρει, and (2) ψυχή αἰὲ ἡκει ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο φέρουσα ζώην. Platonists, I suppose, would consider it wicked to say that Plato has fallen into a confusion here: but a non-Platonist might venture to say so, and to point out that ἐπιφέρειν τινί τι is an ambiguous expression. I presume that any Platonist who would follow me in the interpretation of ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἦ would say that ἐφ' ὅτι stands for ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο ἐφ' ὅτι.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

ΑΝΩΝΙΣ—ΟΝΩΝΙΣ.

THE plant *Aresta bovis* (Anglice Cammock or Rest-harrow) is now called *άνωνίδα*, and the regular Latin form seems to be *Anonis* (the new Latin Thesaurus, which I do not possess, should be consulted for this). The MSS. of Dioscorides also seem to have *άν*. In the very pretty couplet (attributed, I think, by somebody to Philetas and certainly of that school)

ὡς ἂν' ἐχινόποδας¹ καὶ ἂνὰ τρηχεῖαν
ὄνωνιν
φύονται μαλακῶν ἄνθεα λευκοῖον

the best MSS. of Plutarch (who quotes it twice—44 c and 435 a), have at least in one passage *άνωνιν*, but others have *ὄνωνιν*. It seems to me obvious that the correct name of the plant is *άνωνις*, and that *ὄνωνις* is an ancient popular corruption similar to sparrow-grass for asparagus, etc. The corruption did not perpetuate itself in the

¹ I am familiar with this plant, still so called, but cannot give the scientific name. L and S does not identify it. The new edition should consult the living language more in such matters.

modern language, which discarded the word *ὄνος* for ass and substituted a nickname just as we have done. So the *άν* in *άνωνις* has survived after a temporary eclipse by the 'donkey' of popular etymology. I have little hesitation in restoring *άνωνιν* to the couplet at least, as the poet is not one who would have used such a vulgar corruption in what was evidently a passionate passage, and I think in future Greek lexika the word should be entered as *άνωνις*, thus conforming to the Latin.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos.

CORINNA.

MELEAGER in the Proem to his *Stephanus* (vv. 31-2) bestows especial praise on a poetess called Parthenis:

ἐν δὲ καὶ ἐκ λειμῶνος ἀμωμήτοιο σέλινά,
βαῖα διακνίζων ἄνθεα, Παρθενίδος.

She is otherwise unknown, which is at least very remarkable. It would be less so, if he had simply contented himself with mentioning her name and the plant he assigned to her, as he does in most cases.

I suggest that Parthenis is Corinna (*παρθένος* = *κόρη*). He could, of course, have got *Κόριννα* into a verse, but the same applies to Asclepiades whom he calls by his nickname Sikelides. We must simply suppose that he could not get it in as he wished, and so substituted Parthenis.

There are no epigrams in our *Anthology* attributed to Corinna (as there are none attributed to Parthenis or to a few other poets cited in the Proem), but there were epigrams attributed to her (*Suidas* s.v. *Κορίννα*). If there were evidence that she wrote *Παρθένια* (as stated in Smith's *Biographical Dictionary*) my case would be strengthened, but this rests on the Scholion to Aristophanes *Ach.* 720, and however we correct this corrupt Scholion, the Parthenia of Pindar seem to be meant.

I only submit as containing a modicum of probability this conjecture about a poetess who has recently risen from the dead in Egypt. Meleager's

high compliment can scarcely be otherwise explained than by supposing that Parthenis was a lady still alive whom he knew.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos, Greece.

A NOTE ON SOPH. O.T. 980—2.

σὺ δ' εἰς τὸ μητρὸς μὴ φοβοῦ νυμφεύματα·
πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤδη κἂν ὀνείρασιν βροτῶν
μητρὶ ξυνευνάσθησαν.

JEBB has, I think, missed the point of this passage through not observing how small the difference is between dreams and realities to the popular mind, both among the Greeks and in other races. Thus in Pindar, *Ol.* XIII. 65 *sqq.*, Athena visits Bellerophon in a dream; yet the dream is so real that the vision leaves a solid and material bridle behind it. So Artemidoros, I. 35, teaches that it is a good omen for a man being tried on a capital charge to dream that he has lost his head; for the head can be lost only once, and if it be lost in a dream that ends the matter.

Jebb notes: 'κἂν ὀνείρασιν, in dreams also (as well as in this oracle); and as such dreams have proved vain, so may this oracle.' Such is indeed part of the argument which Oedipus and Iokaste use to dispell their fears; but not in this form, nor is this their only consolation. Jocasta is inclined to think all oracles false, because Apollo prophesied that

Laios' son would kill him, whereas the very reverse took place; but as Oedipus has still a lingering faith in them, she falls in with his humour and takes up his own attempt at explanation (*cf.* 969). 'Either,' she says in effect, 'oracles are cheats, or they are so equivocal that the most terrible ones may turn out to be quite harmless. Apollo said you would kill your father and wed your mother; the first part is true in a way, if Polybos died of grief at your absence; the second may equally be true without any guilt on your part. You have probably dreamed of such things, and superstitious folk would say that such a dream is as good as reality for some purposes.' The *καί* may be interpreted either (1) 'in dreams as well as in real life,' or (2) 'in a mere dream and not in reality, as also your killing of Polybos was no reality but a mere metaphor.'

NOTE.—I now see that Prof. Gilbert Murray takes substantially the same view of this passage. See his translation of the play (London, 1911), p. 56:

Prophets deem

A deed wrought that is wrought but in a dream.

I am glad to have the support of a scholar of such acknowledged taste and acuteness for what I had fancied to be simply a guess of my own.

H. J. ROSE.

McGill University, Montreal.

REVIEWS

THE COMPOSITION OF THE ILIAD.

The Composition of the Iliad: an Essay on a numerical law in its structure, by AUSTIN SMYTH, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Librarian of the House of Commons. Longmans. 6s. net. 1914.

THE criticism of Homer is passing from the primary sources, that is to say, the Germans who invent our mistakes, and from the vulgarisateurs who import and vend them, to the hands of scholars

and amateurs. This has long been the case with theology, where the learned parson and the speculative layman steadily augment the literature. Two books of this kind have lately appeared on Homer. One, on the *Odyssey*, by Mr. Thomson, I am to have the honour of noticing elsewhere. Mr. Austin Smyth, who is the Librarian of the House of Commons, a position in which much is excusable, has written a book on the *Composition of the Iliad* which he

defines by his sub-title as an 'Essay on a numerical law in its structure,' and whose object is he says in his preface 'to demonstrate that the *Iliad* of Homer at one time consisted of 13,500 lines, neither more nor less, divided into 45 sections of 300 verses each, with major divisions after the 15th and 30th of these; from which it follows that the remaining 2,193 verses, which appear in our present texts, are more recent additions, and ought to be removed.' An appendix contains a similar proposition with regard to the *Odyssey*. Mr. Smyth appears to be serious in what he advances, and to believe that he has proved it. He has begot however a well-known type of essay. There are no numerical laws; an antistrophe corresponds more or less to a strophe; but strophe, ode, paean and play are of unlimited length, and Mnemosyne does not prompt me with an ancient sonnet. It is none the less a tendency in our minds to discover these non-existent laws. The history of philology is strewn with these weaknesses of noble minds. Decency forbids most of them to be mentioned; but Mr. Smyth—who does not cite much literature—may like to know that Drerup has lately discovered a unit of 1,000 verses, from which it follows that the *Iliad* is a plexus of fifteen 1,000's. Mr. Smyth's unit (300) is arrived at from a consideration of the needs of recitation. So was Drerup's. Drerup tells us he experimented. He was more generous to the rhapsode anyway. Are we to suppose, with Mr. Smyth, the rhapsode, like a Hobbs or a Mr. Spooner, counting his centuries, and playing more freely after the 250 had gone up? I cannot see the faintest likelihood of such a unit, and Mr. Smyth

has made no attempt to make it probable. If he had considered the circumstances of the Panathenaea, or of the country festivals, how many lines the daylight and the patience of the audience allowed each of so many rhapsodes; or endeavoured to establish the compass of the old divisions of Homer as quoted by ancient authors, I do not say he would have arrived at any conclusion, but he would have been on the right tack. I cannot conceive that any theatre full of eager paupers collected for a yearly event would have been satisfied with 300 lines from a single rhapsode; and if not, where is the unit?

The results, that is to say, the elimination of 2,193 lines, which Mr. Smyth obtains by applying his canon, I do not think it necessary to go through, for we all know that when we have a hypothesis we can adapt any material to it, much more so a honeycombed document like the *Iliad*. I hope Dr. Leaf, to whom he makes a general confession in his preface, will forgive him for dealing so lightly with the Trojan Catalogue, that more than primordial fossil.

I have called Mr. Smyth an amateur, and I have expressed a belief in his seriousness. I am not entirely persuaded on the latter point; he seems to me to be too easy in face of the uncertainty which besets us on every side in Homer. He has a taste for literature, and I am far from saying that he has not improved Homer. However, it is so difficult nowadays to satisfy both the truth and an author, that if I receive two of Mr. Smyth's friends or his lawyer, I will withdraw my statements and leave his agreeable book to the public.

T. W. ALLEN.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles.
By R. HACKFORTH, M.A. 8vo. 1 vol.
Pp. 203. Manchester: University
Press, 1913.

ALTHOUGH many foreign scholars, since the days of Ast nearly a century ago, have written at length both for and

against the genuineness of the so-called *Epistles of Plato*, our English Platonists and historians of Classical literature have conspired to ignore the question. It would be hard to point to anything in English which attempts to handle the matter seriously, with the exception of some pages in Grote's *History* and in

Mr. Richards' *Platonica*. Hence the very careful and thoroughgoing examination of the whole subject which Mr. Hackforth offers in the volume before us fills a real gap, and deserves, if only on that account, a grateful welcome from all students of Classics. The most important of the more modern criticisms of the *Epistles* are those by Raeder, Ritter and R. Adam; and the present work is largely based on these, especially in regard to linguistic statistics. Mr. Hackforth's method is to deal with the *Epistles* one by one, giving a summary of the contents of each, and then passing on to consider critical questions as to linguistic affinities, date, objections to authenticity, etc. At the end of his opening chapter ('General Introduction,' p. 34) he thus states his conclusions: 'iii., vii. and viii. I believe to be Platonic beyond all reasonable doubt: iv. and xiii. show evidence of authenticity only next to these: ix., x. and xi. must be left doubtful, chiefly because of their brevity: while i., ii., v., vi., xii. are unquestionably spurious.' By far the most interesting of the letters is, of course, the seventh, and those who regard it as genuine will be glad to find Mr. Hackforth supporting their view; but I, for one, doubt whether I could ever persuade myself to father on Plato what I must still regard—*pace* Mr. Hackforth—as an intolerable *mischmasch*. And I should refuse to be bullied into changing my mind by such epithets as 'subjective' and 'sentimental.' None

the less, what Mr. Hackforth writes in explanation and defence of the 'philosophical digression'—as well as the other digressions—in *Ep.* vii., and his ingenious imaginations as to the state of mind of Dion's party in 353-2 B.C., deserve careful consideration and may even carry conviction to less prejudiced minds.

In dealing with *Ep.* vi. Mr. Hackforth makes the plausible suggestion that the writer is borrowing from the *Symposium*, and he tries to identify the two gods—Father and Son—with the *αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν* and Eros of that dialogue. The former identification is highly improbable, and ascribes to the writer 'a confused memory of the *Symposium*' of a quite preposterous kind. Raeder's identification of the two gods with the World-soul and the Demiurgus is much more probable, and there may be an echo of the *βασιλικὸς νοῦς* and the *αἴτιον* of *Phileb.* 30 D. E., especially as the *σπουδῇ-παιδιά* antithesis is also found in that context. In the course of his discussion Mr. Hackforth makes several interesting contributions to the textual criticism of the *Epistles*—amongst others, the plausible conjecture *ἐφ' ὅμοιότητάς* for *ἐπομνύντας* in the passage in *Ep.* vi. (323 D.) alluded to above. Useful collections of linguistic parallels, and a chronological table, are supplied in three Appendixes. It is a pity that the printing of the Greek is defaced by so many instances of faulty accentuation.

R. G. B.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DER AENEIS.

Die Entstehung der Aeneis. VON ALFRED GERCKE. Pp. 205. Berlin: Wiedemannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 6.

PROFESSOR GERCKE has undertaken a careful and exhaustive examination of the *Aeneid* from the point of view of the analytical rather than the aesthetic critic. His results are reached almost entirely by a consideration of internal evidence; but in c. iv. entitled 'The External Evidence,' he makes exceed-

ingly skilful use of the scanty testimony we possess to support the conclusions to which his analysis has led him. This, as he himself admits, is a reversal of the usual order of procedure. But he maintains consistently the supreme value of analysis, and takes to task the 'Aesthetic' critics (more especially his immediate predecessor, Richard Heinze), for their sentimental and 'anti-vivisection' attitude. 'The critical knife must be wielded by the hand of the linguistic (philologisch) inter-

preter firmly and sternly without respect for sentiment' (p. 7). Professor Gercke has certainly been true to his own principles.

It is difficult to know where to begin in discussing a book which contains so many assertions on points of detail resting upon closely linked and interlocking chains of argument. Into detailed exposition or refutation this is not the place to enter; nor when examining a work on the strength of internal evidence is it possible to generalise broadly as to what is true or false. Everything must be taken in its context, and the appeal must necessarily lie to the judgment of the individual reader. But a summary of the main conclusions may possibly suggest a few remarks as to the methods employed.

The central point of Professor Gercke's thesis, as expounded in cc. iii. and iv., is that the last six books of the *Aeneid* ('the Roman Iliad') bear clear signs of having been composed earlier than the first six books ('the Roman Odyssey') but that we can trace an extensive 'Umarbeitung' of the later books to suit the poet's more mature conception of the story. Here he makes full use of the evidence of Suetonius in Donatus' life (§§ 30, 31) and Propertius (II. 34. 61-6) on the question of date. With regard to the latter passage (written, as is universally admitted, soon after Gallus' death in 26 B.C.), he points out, following Rothstein, that, though in *Lavinia litora* we have a verbal reminiscence of *Aen.* I. 2 (a prelude which stands apart from the body of the work), no reference at all is made to the wanderings of the first six books, but only to the battle of Actium, described in *Aen.* VIII. 675-713, to the wars of Trojan Aeneas, and the foundation of Lavinium, which is not included at all in the existing epic. It is a case where an *argumentum ex silentio* seems to be justified; for an admirer wishing to pick typical scenes from a more or less complete *Aeneid* could hardly have avoided all reference to Books I.-VI. The inference is that Books I.-VI. were not yet put into shape, but that Propertius has seen or heard something of the contents of Books VII.-XII.

NO. CXLV. VOL. XXVIII.

This receives substantial confirmation when we consider the information in Donatus' life as to the gradual growth of the idea of a poem in Virgil's mind 'in quo, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur,' and couple this with the evidence of *Georgics* III. 46-48 ('Mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas Caesaris') and Prop. II. 1. 42 ('Caesaris in Phrygiis condere nomen avos,' etc.), we are surely justified in concluding that the form in which the *Aeneid* first took shape in Virgil's mind was that of a great historical poem, somewhat on the lines of Ennius, which began with the landing of Aeneas in Latium, and culminated in the triumphs of Caesar Augustus. But 'the old legendary history soon threw its chains about him and gradually took the shape of an independent epic. Even then he may still have thought of composing a complete epic cycle; but at the time when Propertius' elegy was written he had postponed, if not wholly given up, the idea of carrying the historical epic down to his own time and celebrating Augustus' victories' (p. 76). Still, that would explain the fact that the wars of Aeneas were already taking shape by 26 B.C., even though when Augustus wrote to Virgil about the same date (on the expedition against the Cantabri, 27-25 B.C.) to know 'how Aeneas was getting on,' Virgil answered, 'tanta inchoata res est, ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar' (Macr. I. 24. 11). This is just the language of a man who is in the first stages of thinking out a great composition: and there is no doubt that Virgil's increasing devotion to philosophy, which he mentions in the same letter, had led him to reconsider his subject and choose as his new theme the character and destiny of a single man actuated by devotion to a divine purpose.

With this part of Professor Gercke's argument I find myself in complete agreement. For if we accept his account of the modification of Virgil's intentions, it is perfectly easy to understand why the subject-matter of Books VII.-XII. engaged his attention first, and not, as

a priori we might have expected, that of Books II., IV., and VI.; though it is quite probable that these were the first to be really finished (*cf.* Suetonius' phrase 'perfecta demum materia' in reference to the recitation of these books to Augustus in 23 B.C.).

In his treatment of the relation of the different books in detail to each other I feel that the writer is less convincing. As is inevitable, he devotes a good deal of attention to discussing the date of Book III., and finally decided it is 'jung und doch alt'—*i.e.* that it was written after the main portion of Books VII.-XII., but before Books I., II., IV., and VI. Here he stands midway between Nettleship and Heinze, the former of whom thinks it 'one of the earliest books which Virgil completed' (*Essay on Virgil's Life and Times*, p. 66), while the latter, on grounds which seem to me absolutely convincing, decides that it was added after at least two-thirds of the work was composed (*Virgils Epische Technik*, p. 93). The unique characteristic of Book III. is, of course, the gradual revelation of Aeneas' destiny; this, according to Professor Gercke, is the earliest conception of the story; in Books VII.-XII., as originally drafted, and in Book III., Aeneas did not know what his 'fata' were. In Books I.-II., parts of IV., V., and VI. he is clearly conscious of his destiny; and this is a later development influenced by Stoicism. But the arguments for the priority of Book III. to Book II. (p. 32) seem to me very weak indeed, and involve the arbitrary separation of III. 500-505 from the rest of Aeneas' farewell to Helenus as a 'later addition,' for which there is not the slightest justification. This, indeed, is one of the dangers of the author's method; for he constantly has recourse to suppression of inconvenient passages and reconstruction of what Virgil 'must have originally written' in order to suit his own theories.

One of the most tantalising chapters is c. vi., in which he discusses the gradual development of the idea of the Stoic εἰμαρμένη in Virgil's mind as the poem grew. Here the arguments are

marshalled with great ingenuity; but the actual relation of Fate to Free-will, whether of gods or men, in Virgil's philosophy, is never fully considered. On the other hand, the exposition of the way in which the Νέκυια in Book VI. first took shape as a conjuration of the dead (Totenbeschwörung), on the model of the *Odyssey*, and only afterwards became a κατάβασις, is both acute and convincing (pp. 187-197); and on several other points, *e.g.* the character of Latinus, and the place taken by Apollo in the scheme of the *Aeneid*, there is much that deserves consideration in the views put forward.

To conclude, the book has the defects of its qualities. It is an interesting experiment conducted with great patience and considerable ingenuity, and one quite worth the making. But in view of the highly speculative nature of its arguments, and the lack of positive evidence, except where other authorities help us, we can hardly admit it to be more. If we remember the way in which Virgil went to work at the *Aeneid*, 'prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens,' with 'tibicines' to prop the incomplete parts of the edifice, we necessarily feel that all analysis in detail of the stages of composition must be largely in the nature of guesswork, depending in the last resort on subjective impressions and individual standards. Exactly how much consistency in detail we have a right to demand from the author of a great epic is a question that will never be agreed upon; but upon the whole it would appear from the book before us that the only sure advance in Virgilian criticism must lie along 'aesthetic' rather than 'analytical' lines; in other words, it must insist rather on starting from the essential unity of design in the *Aeneid* than on emphasising inconsistencies of detail which, however alluring the clues they provide to those determined to explore the labyrinth of a poet's workshop, do little to impair the breadth and singleness of the whole masterpiece.

L. W. HUNTER.

New College, Oxford.

TWO EDITIONS OF LUCAN.

M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libros Decem tertium edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. 8vo. Pp. lviii + 395. Lipsiae: Teubner, MCMXIII. M. 4.40.

THE Teubner text of Lucan has fittingly celebrated its majority by appearing in a third edition. It is hardly possible to overestimate the debt which the textual criticism of the poet owes to the self-sacrificing labours of Dr. Hosius. If a few details in the edition still seem open to criticism, they are of slight importance when contrasted with the solid merits of the work as a whole. One can only hope that the ominous words of the Preface—'cum iam in eo sit, ut ex campo in umbram secedam'—do not preclude all prospect of further contributions from the learned editor to the subject which he has made his own.

The second edition was noticed at considerable length in these columns (October, 1906). The chief novelty in the latest edition consists in the grammatical and metrical indices, which contain some very useful statistics compiled with true German thoroughness. No student of the Latin hexameter can afford to neglect Index III. Index II. opens with 'orthographica quaedam,' from which we see that the best MSS. strongly support the spellings *uolgus*, *uolnus*, *uolsus*, etc.; and indeed it is not unlikely that Lucan and many other poets of the Empire preferred to retain these older spellings. *Neclego*, a spelling which is slowly gaining recognition, is well attested by the best codices, and Hosius has rightly adopted it in his text.

After the orthographical notes we find some interesting details as to the gender of nouns, 'poetical' and other singulars and plurals, and heteroclitics, then very full information about the declension of nouns and adjectives and about the remaining parts of speech. The chief impression conveyed by these lists is, as we should expect, that metrical convenience largely determined the choice of word-forms. We are not surprised to find it stated, for instance,

that *Libye* is the only form of the nominative found in Lucan, or that he uses the forms *Brundisii*, *Dyrrachii*, *coniugii*, and on the other hand *Corfini*, *Domili*, *Hortensi*. But such lists are by no means useless. It is helpful to know that Lucan avails himself of the form *Libye* when the nominative is wholly excluded, for example, by Vergil and Valerius Flaccus, and it is useful to learn that he avoids single *-i* in the genitive of *-io*-stems except in a few proper names. Indeed Hosius' index is far from being limited to self-evident facts. On p. 376 we are reminded of the extraordinary *natrix uiolator* (IX. 720), and it is pointed out that Lucan treats *dies* and *serpens* indifferently as masculine or feminine. On the next page we find that he wrote *fastibus* = *fastis*, and that there is good MSS. authority for *fastus* = *fastos*. Turning over a few pages we find it recorded that the pronoun *is* occurs only once in the nominative (also *eum* and *eam* each once), that *tanti* (and even *tantus* once) is used of number, that *adsentio* is employed instead of the deponent form, that *iaculatus* is found in a passive sense, and that we meet with *absorpsi* as Perf. of *absorbeo*. These are only a few instances taken almost at random.

Some small criticisms may perhaps be offered on this part of the book. It seems unnecessary, if not misleading, to record, in an *Index Grammaticus*, forms which are merely the vagaries of certain MSS., such as *lampadis*, Nom. Plur., *furoris*, Acc. Plur. The space saved by the omission of these might have been occupied by a few brief parenthetical notes which a scholar with Hosius' knowledge could have written without trouble, e.g., p. 379, '*noton* (non nisi apud L., ut uidetur),' p. 382, '*fuscolor* (ἄπ. εἰρ.).' On p. 377, col. 1, '*verber*' is misleading; of course only the Gen. and Abl. of the singular are used by Lucan, and the word ought rather to have been classed with the *defectiva* on the next page. P. 379, col. 1, *Ariminon* (I. 231), though only a conjecture, is very possibly right, and was worth mentioning. Ib., col. 2,

Aegypti (X. 159) surely cannot be Nom. Plur. Pp. 382 sq. The section on adjectives might well have included a list of characteristic compounds, some of which seem to be found only in Lucan (*fatilegus* IX. 821, *harenuagus* IX. 941, *irredux* IX. 408, *taurifer* I. 473). P. 383, col. 1, *hic = meus*. Add VII. 117. *Ib. quis = uter*. Add VII. 281. P. 383, col. 2, '*triumphatus* II. 90, (*auditus* IV. 716 VIII. 361).' This is not clearly expressed; the meaning is that in the two passages quoted *auditus* = 'heard of,' not 'heard.' P. 386, col. 1, *qualiter*. Add I. 100. P. 387, col. 1. Add *nec non* V. 703, VII. 161, IX. 1062, X. 133, 258, 519; *nec non et* VII. 56, X. 486.

In the present edition the *Praefatio* is revised and enlarged and the *apparatus criticus* is altered in many places, chiefly through a fresh examination of M by the editor himself, and by means of Bick's new collation of the Vienna palimpsest and Endt's edition of the *Adnotationes*. The record of the readings of Z has undergone some changes. On comparing it with my own collation for several hundred lines of Book II. and Book IV., I have found in the latter case that we agree almost entirely, but in Book II. there are still some discrepancies which, though not, perhaps, of great importance, tempt one to wish for an opportunity of re-examining the codex. Account has been taken of suggestions on the text issued since the publication of the second edition (1905), but as the editor has refrained from increasing the bulk of the *apparatus*, some interesting conjectures have remained unnoticed, e.g. *pater* for *sacer* in IV. 191 (Garrod in *C.Q.* V., p. 214), *sinu* for *manu* in VIII. 770 (Postgate). Into the text itself very few changes have been introduced; the only one of importance which I have noticed is *Lingonas* (I. 398), which is certainly right. One would gladly have seen more changes. A scholar so sound as Hosius must be aware that several of the readings in his text cannot be what Lucan wrote. In such cases, if no conjecture is convincing enough to be adopted, we might have expected to find some indication of the state of matters, either in the text or (preferably)

in the apparatus. It seems quite impossible to defend the traditional reading in I. 688, *nunc desuper Alpīs | nubiferae colles atque aeriam Pyrenen | abripimur*, or in VII. 735, *fessis aut Marte subactis* (of Caesar's soldiers after a victory), yet in these and in not a few other instances Hosius gives no hint that he considers the traditional text unsound. Thus the casual observer might be led to suppose that the greatest living authority on Lucan believes that his poet was capable of writing impossible Latin or sheer nonsense.

The editor still shows the scholarly caution which we admired in his previous recensions, and he still regards M and Z as presenting the best tradition. When he adopts a reading which is comparatively ill-supported (e.g. at II. 426, IV. 20, *ib.* 86), one cannot but feel that he does so with good reason—indeed, a little more boldness in this direction might have been welcome. The combination V P G Q might well have induced even a cautious editor to write *sint* in VIII. 645 (*nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa | viscera sint Magni*); *sunt* cannot really be proved correct by I. 126 and IX. 563, and Hosius here, as in some other places (e.g. I. 648, VII. 317, and probably IV. 719, to take the first instances that occur to me), seems to pamper M and Z unduly. It is rather surprising to find *voluit* still read instead of *voluit* in VII. 658, in spite of Curtius, Dr. Postgate, and the scholiast. In the matter of punctuation, an excessive conservatism seems to have led our editor astray, but occasionally he errs even when some of his predecessors have been correct. If he has not seen Mr. J. D. Duff's article (*Journ. of Phil.*, vol. xxxii., pp. 127, 133), in which the true punctuation of VIII. 118 sq. and 549 sq. is pointed out, he could have found the first passage correctly punctuated in the editions of Schrevelius and Oudendorp, and the second in the edition of Stephanus (1545). Other instances of misleading punctuation occur at I. 9 (where the preceding *quis* shows that we ought to read *cruorem*?), IV. 508 (read *vita*?), VII. 475 (read *manus*?), VIII. 319 (read *ortu.*). This list could easily be increased.

I have noticed only one typographical

error, '640' for '460' in the *apparatus criticus*, p. 209.

W. B. ANDERSON.

Manchester University.

M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili. Liber VII. Edited by J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.B.A. 8vo. Pp. xxxviii + 98. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1913. 2s.

IN 1896 Dr. Postgate earned the gratitude of all students of Lucan by his admirable edition of Book VII. A new edition has now been issued, in which some corrections and several improvements have been made in the commentary, a supplementary note has been appended to the Introduction, and the Critical Appendix has been considerably shortened. The last-mentioned change will cause some regret among those who have used the first edition. Dr. Postgate's textual notes are always illuminating and never dull, and we should have been glad to see them increased both in size and in number. Indeed, the only real fault to be found in the edition as a whole is its brevity. When we read, for example (n. on v. 110), that 'the plup. is often used in Latin for clearness or other reasons instead of the aor.', we may be pardoned for wishing that a grammarian so accomplished as the editor had given more freely of the fruits of his observation. But doubtless the plan of the edition seemed to preclude such fulness of comment, and it must be gratefully acknowledged that within his self-imposed limits Dr. Postgate has packed a wonderful amount of explanation and illustration. The fact that we feel inclined to 'ask for more' is sufficient proof of our appreciation of the fare set before us.

The changes in the text are few; the most notable is the restoration of the MSS. reading, *erigitur*, in v. 141, instead of the editor's tempting *corrigitur*. The traditional reading is now convincingly supported by means of similar passages in Statius. Francken's *seu* is adopted in v. 459 in place of *si*, and it certainly seems an improvement.

One would like to quote some of the many good things to be found in the

commentary, but in the case of a work which has been before the public for eighteen years we may assume that its qualities are well known and duly appreciated. It will suffice, therefore, to make a few remarks which might perhaps be considered when the next edition is in preparation.

v. 25, delete comma after '72 n.'

vv. 28-32 (Commentary and Addenda):

'unde pares somnos populus noctemque beatam? o felix, si te uel sic tua Roma uideret! donassent utinam superi patriaeque tibi que unum, Magne, diem, quo fati certus uterque extremum tanti fructum raperetis amoris.'

This piece of strained rhetoric does not seem to be completely explained, but the editor's (and Professor Housman's) interpretation of *populus* (v. 28) as 'the peoples of Italy' is certainly necessary to a right understanding of the passage. I venture to think that if we note the following points the meaning and the connexion will become clear. (1) *Somnos* in v. 28 is a deliberate echo of *somnos* in v. 24 (*ne rumpite somnos, | castrorum uigiles*): 'disturb not Pompey's slumbers: would that the peoples of Italy might enjoy such slumbers as his (*pares somnos*) with such happy illusions of the night (*noctem beatam*). (2) *uel sic = uel per pares somnos noctemque beatam*, even in a mere dream, like Pompey's, of a happiness now past and gone. (3) *noctem* (v. 28) is contrasted with *diem* (v. 31), and *fati certus* is emphatic: better than such a happy vision of the night would it have been if Rome and Pompey had been granted one day in which, with their destiny staring them in the face (not hidden by the glamour of a dream), they might taste for the last time the blessedness of their love. I suppose that *O felix, si* means 'O happy thou if . . .', but the sense would be somewhat improved if we could take *felix* with *tua Roma*, and this does not seem impossible when we consider how fond Lucan is of postponing the subject of a sentence.

v. 44. It might have been mentioned that *non* modifies the whole sentence, and is not to be taken with *pleno*; cf. I. 339, 455. 77. Livy (also Verg.) uses *uellere* in this sense. 117 *hoc*. Cf. v. 305. 127. Cf. V. 586. 135. Cf. I. 72-80. 145 (quotation from Stat.). For *haud*

read *non*. 162. -i in Abl. of comparatives is well attested in Livy. See also Hosius,³ p. 381. 214. 'The Act. radio is a myth.' There is, however, considerable authority for it in Flor. II. 13. 30 (IV. 2). 307. Cf. I. 325 sq. 308. Add V. 771; cf. II. 287 and Stat. *passim*. 320. A further n. on *non* with Jussive Subj. in post-Aug. Latin would have been welcome. 322. *Turbate* surely almost = *confundite* (v. 575); *uultus*, especially with *uerendos*, is not quite = *facies*. By viciously striking at the faces they are to obliterate the reverend look that might otherwise 'give them pause.' *Turb.* gives the sense of violently mixing up. Some familiar slang expressions (one of which has become almost classic) inevitably suggest themselves as equivalent to Lucan's brutal words, but in translating we shall have to be content with 'shatter their reverend looks,' or something similar.

340 and 510. Not mentioned in the Crit. App., to which the nn. refer the reader. 365. Is not *in medium* to be taken with *collectum*, *superf. com.* being Dative with *dabimus*? 373. The first part of the passage quoted from Sil. is suggested by Luc. I. 188. 392. Read *Inui* for *Inuri*. 395 *coacta*. Add IV. 798. 406. Would it not be better to read *nec* in the passage quoted from Ovid? This use of *ne* without a word such as *sic*, *eo*, *hactenus* preceding seems open to question. 436. It seems more natural and effective to take *incognita* as agreeing with *Roma* and used 'in the predicate' with *seruisses*. 477. A fuller n. desirable. See Obermeier, *Sprachgebrauch des M. A. Lucanus*, p. 35. 518 *coactum*. Is the expression really so strange? It can be paralleled in English as well as in Latin. 493. *umbonibus* prob. 'shields' in this passage. 497 *per . . . per*. Cf. III. 24, VI. 639, 734. 510. Imitation in Val. Flacc. 6. 31 might have been mentioned. 519. Cf. Claud. Stil. I. 258. 537. Add VI. Cons. Hon. 209. 568 (quotation from Sil. It.). For 439 read 441. 617. For 27 read 78. 740 *cunctis*. Surely Dat. 777 *Scythica ara*. Cf. I. 446, III. 86. 779 *humator*. Perhaps it was worth noting that this is *ἄν εἶπ.*; similarly *fuscator*, IV. 66. Lucan is very fond of words in -tor, several of which

are hardly found elsewhere. See Fick, *Krit. u. sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Lukian*, pp. 47 sqq.

A few notes on the Critical Appendix may be added.

v. 2. For 'Burmman' read 'Burman.' 180. The expression *mentibus unum | hoc solamen erat* is surely so natural that the poet might have written it without any thought of a contrast between *mentibus* and the *oculos* of the previous sentence. It seems, therefore, rather doubtful if we ought to resort to emendation. 421 'omnibus armis; so Hosius.' But Hosius now (edd. 2 and 3) reads *annis*. 452. For *intulit* read *impulit*. 460-1 (see Hosius' *apparatus criticus*). A well-known crux, about which every student of Lucan has a theory. Dr. Postgate professes merely to give 'what Lucan may have written.' The problem is too large and thorny to be discussed within the limits of a short review. Perhaps I may give my opinion very briefly, hoping for some future opportunity of either supporting or retracting it. Like Dr. Postgate, I would follow those MSS. (including the ancient palimpsest), which put v. 463 before v. 462, but I think that *tempus* probably came from a mis-quotation by Lactantius. The following seems a possible reading:

'quo sua pila cadant, aut qua sibi fata minentur inde manus, spectant; uultus cognoscere possunt, facturi quae monstra forent: uidere parentes,' etc.

i.e. they reconnoitre the enemy's position in order to see where they themselves and their foes are most open to attack. To their surprise they can recognise the faces of their opponents, and thus they realise what outrages they are on the eve of committing, for they see their fathers and brothers. For *uultus cognoscere* cf. V. 20. The change of *cognoscere* to *quo noscere* can easily be illustrated from the MSS. of Lucan. In IV. 168-172 there is a similar passage, which seems to lend considerable support to the view here propounded, especially in the case of a poet so prone to repeat himself as Lucan is. Since making the above emendation I have found that Leo has proposed *cognoscere* (see Samse, *Interpretationes Lucanae*, pp. 20 sq.), though he gives it a very

different context. 735. Possibly *iam Marte peracto* (cf. 249, Val. Flacc. 6. 436), *subactis* having crept in from v. 613. 748. Burman's *galeas* ought perhaps to have been mentioned. 765. *miseris*, with the punctuation proposed, is rather more effective, but it does not follow

that Lucan wrote it. There are some reasons for retaining *miseri*; see Haslauer's pamphlet, *Zu Lucans Pharsalia, Liber VII.*, pp. 42-44.

W. B. ANDERSON.

Manchester University.

A STUDY OF AUGUSTINE'S VERSIONS OF GENESIS.

A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis. By JOHN S. MCINTOSH. Published by the Cambridge Press as Agents for the University of Chicago Press. 1912. 3s.

THIS is a careful piece of work in a corner of a wide field. The importance of the Old Latin Versions of the Bible lies in their antiquity, their witness to the contemporary Greek text, and their influence in moulding the thought and language of the Western Church. Thus we know from St. Cyprian's habitual use of it that a Latin translation of the Scriptures was current in Africa by A.D. 250; and, on account of the extreme fidelity with which the O.L. follows the LXX., it serves as evidence for a condition of the text earlier than that of the oldest Greek MSS. Fragments of this venerable translation exist in MSS. at Lyons, Würzburg, Munich, and the Vatican, dating from the sixth to the eighth centuries; otherwise it is chiefly known from abundant quotations in the early Fathers. The texts at our disposal raise many problems which have not yet been solved. What, for example, was the native home of the Version? It used to be called the *Vetus Itala*, but that designation begs too many questions to be allowed to stand. The earliest traces of a Latin Bible are found in North Africa; but this may only be due to the fact that the Latin literature of the second and third centuries is almost entirely African; and, owing to the close intercourse between Rome and Carthage at that period, there is no difficulty in supposing that the Version was brought over from Italy. Recent investigation, however, inclines our best authorities to look in the direction of Syria or Asia Minor for its birthplace, on account of

its intimate relations with the so-called 'Western' text of the N.T. and with the Syriac Versions. But have we the right to speak of a Version at all? Does not the evidence rather imply a number of independent translations? Or should we rather describe them as different recensions of a common archetype? The remarkable thing about the passages quoted by the Fathers is the number of variants in the text. Perhaps St. Augustine's allusion to the '*infinita varietas Latinorum interpretum*' ought not to be applied to this state of affairs, but an instance from St. Augustine himself will make it clear. He quotes the famous passage '*till Shiloh come*' (Gen. xlix. 10) under three forms: (1) *donec veniant quae reposita sunt ei*, (2) *donec veniat cui repromissum est* (so Cyprian), (3) *donec veniat cui repositum est* (the most usual form in the Fathers). These differences, it is to be noticed, are not due to carelessness or lapse of memory, for they reflect corresponding variations in the LXX.; of which the standard text reads *ὡς ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ*, with the variants, given by different groups of cursives, *ὃ ἀπόκειται αὐτῷ*, *ὃ ἀπόκειται*, *ὃ ἀπόκειται*. This illustration shows how complicated the problem is; it may also suggest the kind of answer which should be given to the questions raised above.

With much pains Mr. McIntosh has collected all St. Augustine's quotations from Genesis, amounting to 551 verses or parts of verses, and printed them consecutively, with valuable notes. Then, in order to determine whether St. Augustine used more than one version, he has analysed the various readings under such headings as the use of synonyms, a different form of construction, a different underlying Greek

text, a change in order, and the addition or omission of words. As a result of his enquiry he comes to the conclusion that the evidence points to several recensions of an original text rather than to independent translations. For due weight must be given to agreements as well as to differences; many verses of Gen. i.-iii., for example, in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* agree verbatim with those quoted in *De Genesi ad litteram*; and throughout all the quotations exact correspondences in words and phrases occur in the midst of a large element of variation. Moreover, since the same phenomena appear in the quotations of Tertullian and St. Cyprian, it would seem that they too made use of codices which go back to the same original translation as the recensions which St. Augustine handled. The case is similar with the Lyons MS. (No. 54), which has many points in common with St. Augustine's citations. Thus Mr. McIntosh confirms the judgment expressed by Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy in his important article on the Latin Versions in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii, p. 49a: 'One is bound to admit, at least, the increasing probability of the conclusion that at the basis of all the types of text there is one original version, which has determined, in great measure, the character of all the subsequent revisions.'

Mr. McIntosh devotes his last chapter to an examination of the language of the Old Latin Bible—a subject of great interest. Two noteworthy features come out. The first is the presence of a large number of forms characteristic of the *sermo plebeius*; e.g. substantives with terminations like *abominatio*, *divisio*, *incolatus*, *procreatura*, *nutritor*, *reliquarium* (i.e. remnant); adjectives, such as *fumabundus*, *cognoscibilis*, *pelliceus*; denominative verbs, such as *adaquare*, *appropriare* (= Vulg. *appropinquare*), *principari*; and the frequent use of compounds which have sunk to the level of simple verbs. A long list of rare words and departures from classical usage has been compiled. With regard to syntax, we are inclined to go further than Mr. McIntosh in recognising the influence of the LXX. and, through the LXX., of Hebrew idiom. Thus we cannot agree that *Fulvi oculi eius a vino*

et dentes candidiores lacte (Gen. xlix. 12) 'admits of two interpretations'; *a vino* is not an ablative of cause, but a reproduction of the Gk. *ὑπὲρ οἴνον*, which again is an attempt to express the Hebrew comparative. Equally Hebraic is the barbarism *non potest ad eum* (Gen. xxxii. 25), mediated through the Greek. And the same explanation must be given of the frequent expressions of the type, *Sem filius centum annorum cum genuit* etc. This is a familiar Hebraism; and we doubt whether in its Latin or Greek form it had its origin in colloquial use; the illustration from a Latin epitaph, *septem me naalam annorum gremio ipse recepit* (C.I.L. i. 1011)—an idiom fairly common in the inscriptions (Olcott, *Thes. Ling. Lat. Epigr.* i., p. 334)—is not strictly parallel nor sufficient to prove the point.

The other striking feature of the Latinity of these texts is its close imitation of the Greek of the LXX., which is deeply dyed with Semitisms. Mr. McIntosh illustrates this continually, but he does not always bring out clearly enough the ultimate source of the characteristics which he marks for notice. With his conclusion we quite agree. The Latinity of the Old Latin Bible exhibits some colloquialisms; but the underlying Greek original is the source of the greater number of its peculiarities; the colloquial elements, however, are not distinctive enough to enable us to determine the home of the translation (pp. 123-4).

In his introductory chapter on the general problem Mr. McIntosh naturally makes use of Dr. Kennedy's article referred to above, without adding much of his own. He would have shown more skill if he had digested his authorities instead of merely tabulating their opinions. A Latin scholar ought not to say that Peter Sabatier's great work was published 'at Remis' (*sic*); such a word as 'rendition' for 'rendering' may be an Americanism, but it ought not to appear in a work of scholarship. These, however, are minor matters. Mr. McIntosh has made a promising start on an important subject, and we hope that he will carry his study further.

G. A. COOKE.

Christ Church, Oxford.

ROMAN IDEAS OF DEITY.

Roman Ideas of Deity in the last Century before the Christian Era: Lectures delivered in Oxford for the Common University Fund. By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., etc. Pp. vii + 166. Macmillan and Co. 1914.

MR. WARDE FOWLER holds a unique place among writers on Roman Religion, in that he is not content with the collection of beliefs or even with the anthropological interpretation of rites, but has made the much more difficult attempt to penetrate behind them to the consciousness of the people who held these beliefs and performed the rites. In his *Religious Experience of the Romans* he traced this consciousness on its emotional side, showing how the Roman people were affected by their religion: in the present course of lectures—almost tantalisingly brief—he attempts to discover within the limits of a single century what were the current intellectual conceptions of deity among the educated classes and more particularly in the mind of the common people. To the casual reader the results may seem disappointing: the conceptions which Mr. Fowler presents to us are for the most part rather vague and nebulous, and there is a very manifest lack of coherence between them. But the reasons for this are not far to seek. In the first place, the last century of the pre-Christian era which Mr. Fowler has selected as his field was, from the religious point of view, as from many others, the most unsettled period in the history of Rome: the traditional religion had lost its force, except in the household worship, and in some aspects of the State-cult. Philosophy, in so far as it touched religious questions, maintained for the most part a critical and negative attitude; the Oriental cults had as yet a very insecure hold, and the worship of the Man-god, in the person of the Emperor, was in its infancy: it was no doubt just this coincidence of dying and nascent elements which Mr. Fowler found fruitful and attractive. Secondly, it was of the very essence of the genuine Italian religion to be vague and undefined in its

conception of deity, and though both Greek religion and Greek philosophy had to some extent sharpened the outlines—and in many cases distorted them—much of the ancient indefiniteness lingered on even in the minds of professed thinkers like Cicero and Varro. It is in fact a mistake to expect to find any clear-cut idea of a god or of divine power in the Roman mind, and we must be content with hints and glimpses where we can get them.

Such glimpses Mr. Fowler finds in four directions—(1) in the worship of the family, and especially in the conception of the *genius*; (2) in the position of Jupiter in the State-worship, in which he finds traces of monotheism; (3) in the cult of Fortuna as a world-power; (4) in the growing idea of the Man-god. On all of these subjects his work is full of illuminating suggestions and apt illustrations, and everywhere he adds to our knowledge, and opens up new fields of enquiry. Most readers will probably feel that the most original and suggestive of his views are those under the second and fourth of these heads. Let us, however, first glance at the other two. (1) Mr. Fowler emphasises, as he had already done in the *Religious Experience*, the vitality of the family worship, and in a very interesting section (pp. 17-22) points out that among the family *numina*, that which contained the germ of theology most conspicuously was the *genius* of the *paterfamilias*. Its essential connection with his individuality, gives to it a distinct notion of personality, which had a general theological value, and also paved the way, as he points out later (p. 90), for the deification of the Emperor; and in its more extended uses, of places, societies, and institutions, it brought out the idea of a vital force—a limited replica, as it were, of the notion of a cosmic power. What one misses in Mr. Fowler's account of the *genius* is a clear expression of what the original notion was in the household cult: sometimes it seems to be spoken of as a power resident in the head of the household himself; sometimes, es-

pecially when it is compared to the Greek conception of the *δαίμων*, as an external power protecting him. It would surely be historically true to say that in the genuine Roman religion the former was the conception: the *genius* was the *numen* in the paterfamilias, his power to continue the family, just as Vesta resided in the hearth and the Penates in the store-cupboard. Later on, and largely owing to the influence of the Greek notion of *δαίμων*, it became thought of as an external guardian, and so could be used of legions, schools, and colonies (p. 20). No doubt the average Roman of Cicero's time hovered between the two notions, but when we are trying to define theological conceptions we may fairly distinguish between them. (3) In his very interesting treatment of *Fortuna* (pp. 61-80), Mr. Fowler insists that for the best minds in the best periods she was thought of not as a blind or capricious force, like the Greek *Τύχη*, but rather as 'the *numen* presiding over the incalculable element in human life,' which man by his own *virtus*, the action of his free will, can to some extent both forestall and modify. *Fortuna* is thus at times (p. 73 ff.) almost identified with *natura* as the systematic working of law. 'But never quite so identified,' I should be inclined to add, and I cannot resist pointing out that the two passages in Lucretius (v. 77 and 107) which Mr. Fowler quotes for this identity do in reality exactly bring out the difference between the two conceptions. In the first,

praeterea solis cursus lunaeque meatus
expediam qua vi flectat *natura* gubernans,

he is dealing with the permanent unvarying motions of sun and moon: these are a matter of absolutely fixed and unchangeable law, which can be known and even, with certain reservations for an Epicurean, explained by man: they are therefore in the province of *natura*. In the second passage Lucretius is telling us that the end of the world may come at any moment to confirm his argument that the world itself is mortal—'quod procul a nobis flectat *fortuna* gubernans'—*fortuna* here, because though the end of the world is no less than the revolution of the sun

due to the operation of law, it is no recurrent predictable event, but the result of many complex processes which put it outside the sphere of human calculation. There we have, I think, exactly the real distinction between *natura* and *fortuna*: *fortuna* is not opposed to *natura*, it is indeed a subdivision of it, but it covers the workings of *natura* when they are beyond human calculation and therefore appear to us as luck or coincidence. This was exactly the notion of Democritus, though not of Epicurus, and I believe that Lucretius' return to the earlier idea was due to the current Roman conception which Mr. Fowler has so well brought out.

The two chapters on *The Idea of the Man-god* and *The Deification of Caesar* not only explain another route by which Romans arrived at a new theological conception, but form an important contribution to the study of a very difficult problem. In the earlier chapter Mr. Fowler insists strongly that the notion of a Man-god was wholly foreign to genuine Italian religious thought: the idea of the *genius* came nearest to it and could be deftly used to support it, as it was by Augustus, but could not of itself have developed into deification. On the other hand, by Cicero's time, through Greek and Oriental influences, Romans were familiar with the idea, and it had indeed been applied to great Roman commanders in the provinces: Mr. Fowler might have brought the notion even nearer home to Italy than he has by reference to the institution of the *Marcellia* in Sicily, and its absurd parody in the *Verria*, and the statue of Verres Soter (Cic. in *Verr.* II. II. 63, 154). In the later chapter the history of Caesar's deification is re-examined with great subtlety and penetration. Antony's attempt at deification before Caesar's murder was, Mr. Fowler thinks, wholly personal to him; it was based on the Oriental ideas with which he was familiar, was repugnant to Roman feeling and may even, as he suggests (p. 118), have been intended to entice Caesar to his downfall. Popular feeling did not follow at once on Caesar's death, but was roused later by the comet and the eclipse (p. 121), and

when it had once taken root was very carefully controlled by authority, striving always to correlate it with already accepted ideas. Here we have a very clear and probable narrative of the course of events. With the subsequent action of Augustus, both with regard to Julius' deification and his own, Mr. Fowler deals on traditional lines, holding that Augustus sanctioned the worship of Julius, but refused his own in his lifetime. The one difficulty here seems to be the attitude of the Court poets: in many familiar passages, among the Augustans, such as Virg. *Ecl.* i. 41-5 and Hor. *Od.* iii. 3. 12 (where Mr. Fowler allows the reading *bibit* on p. 128, but emphatically rejects it on p. 152), it is hard to resist the impression that the poets intended a present deification of Augustus. Mr. Fowler suggests (p. 126) that in such places we have a 'proleptic assumption' of divinity, but how does a 'proleptic assumption' really differ from a present attribution? Is it not safer to acknowledge that Court flattery went beyond the limits which Augustus had laid down for official acknowledgment and that, for all his public caution, their suggestions were not in private distasteful to him?

The most original and suggestive of the lectures is undoubtedly that on *Jupiter and the Tendency to Monotheism*. Mr. Fowler's contention, put briefly, is that the unique position of Jupiter in the State-cult seems to point back to a period of very early monotheism—such is attested in some of the religions of the Far East. From this polytheism was a degeneracy, and the monotheistic Jupiter was swallowed up in the many gods of the Italian religion, as we know it, to re-emerge in the Ciceronian age under the influence of science and philosophy. This is of course a momentous contention, and if it could be established for Roman and, as Mr. Fowler suggests, also for Greek religion, it would almost revolutionise the accepted history of their development. I can only here suggest some considerations which indicate that we ought to be very cautious about proceeding further on these lines. (1) The evidence for anything like a primitive monotheism in Italy is exceedingly small.

In early Rome the Jupiter of the Palatine settlement seems to hold no very commanding position: the Ides of each month, it is true, were sacred to him, but so were the Kalends to Juno. The only annual festival associated with him is the Vinalia, and that represents but a small department of the life of early Rome. Indeed it looks as if Mars meant more to the early Palatine Romans than Jupiter, and if we turn to the position of Jupiter in the Latin league, which Mr. Fowler emphasises, he seems to be to the undivided Latins what Mars was to the Palatine Romans and Quirinus to those on the Quirinal, *primus inter pares*, but not more. (2) Lucretius' monotheism, on which Mr. Fowler lays some stress, may be exaggerated. There is no doubt throughout the poems the sense of a force behind the workings of the world—which I should see perhaps more in such phrases as *natura creatrix* (II. 1116) and *perfica natura* (II. 1115) than in some which Mr. Fowler quotes—but when we speak of it as a 'vital force,' we must not forget that life itself was to the Epicurean only a peculiar form of atomic motion, and that 'nature' remains for him something essentially concrete and material: at any rate this has nothing to do with Jupiter. (3) Nor surely can we put much stress on the use of 'Jupiter' by Cicero and others to represent something like the 'world-spirit' of the Stoics; it is not the outcome of any belief associated with the State-cult, but a lax use, almost a metaphor, to express a nascent idea. I confess that I cannot yet see reason to depart from the belief that the old Roman religion is essentially a polytheism, or rather 'multinuminism,' and that it is philosophic speculation in the Ciceronian age which first gives birth to the new monotheistic idea. But the suggestion is infinitely important, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Fowler will develop it further.

It goes without saying that the lectures are full of the charm which Mr. Fowler always lays on us, and that no one will be able to read them without finding new and fascinating ideas.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

ANCIENT TOWN-PLANNING.

Ancient Town-Planning. By F. Haverfield. 8vo. Clarendon Press, 1913. 6s. net.

PROFESSOR HAVERFIELD'S work appears at an opportune time, when town plans are being much discussed in other countries as well as our own, but it will not have a merely passing interest. It deals admirably with a subject which has not been treated before in a connected manner, and it must long remain an indispensable aid for students of the ancient world. The inclusion of very many plans and illustrations of ancient town sites is in itself a great boon. The material has been gathered from widely scattered sources, and has in great part been hitherto difficult of access, excepting within the walls of great libraries. Professor Haverfield's comments and criticisms take cognisance to the fullest extent of the literature pertaining to the subject, and are informing and judicious, whether he is testing the opinions of others or advancing his own. Some views which he puts forward about the growth of Pompeii are particularly interesting.

The problems which the theme presents are often of great complexity. The book recognises the readiness with which the rectangular arrangement of streets springs up independently in different lands and in different ages. The modern French towns in North Africa often resemble in this respect those in the same region of Roman age. The plan of New York bears no small similarity to some of those in this book. Old Barcelona is of irregular shape; the great new quarter is laid out in the fashion of New York or Priene. The latest light, however, on the Continent, witnesses to somewhat of a revulsion from straight lines. In new boulevards constructed in several places, Strassburg, for instance, curved lines are being deliberately adopted as being more beautiful. Professor Haverfield is properly cautious in dealing with current views about the passage from land to land of ideas concerning the planning of towns. He rightly points

out that Varro, who supposed that the Romans learned from Etruria the ritual proper to be followed on the foundation of a new town, is not known to have asserted that the internal construction of Roman towns reflected Etruscan models. Only the method of defining the town walls, and the 'centuriatio' and 'limitatio' of the surrounding territory, were referred by Varro to an Etruscan origin. Had he held the view commonly attributed to him, the history of Etruscan towns would have justified its rejection. The notion that regular town-planning came to the Romans from Greece via Etruria, which Nissen and many other scholars have maintained, has no solid foundation. I feel disinclined, on the evidence, to admit even what Professor Haverfield allows, that knowledge of the structure of Greek towns induced the Romans to render their own plans more regular. The development may well have been indigenous.

Several passages in the volume raise the question to what extent cities, particularly in Italy, were reconstructed or reorientated on the reception of new colonists, in the later period of the Republic, or the earliest age of the Empire. My impression is that this was of rare occurrence. The settlers, veterans for the most part, were sent to cultivate the land, and their dwellings would naturally be outside the walls, at all events in the main. A passage of Granius Licinianus describes how the old burgesses of *Faesulae* assailed the 'castella' of the new Sullan settlers. There would necessarily, however, be a re-measurement of the territory, and a delimitation of that portion which was left to the old inhabitants. This is attested in the case of several towns, for instance *Arretium*, where there were three classes of burgesses, the 'Arretini veteres,' 'Fidentiores' (Sulla's colonists), and 'Julienses' (planted there by Caesar or Octavian). When Caesar divided up the lands of *Capua* there was a new survey and measurement, but we hear nothing of any portion of the city having been assigned to the colonists, or of any remodelling of

the city as a consequence of the settlement. The exploration of Pompeii has not made it probable that the town itself was 'repeopled' (p. 63) by Sulla, though Nissen supposed that at that time the western wall was thrown down, to allow of an extension to receive the settlers. Until Augustus was firmly settled on the throne, there would be little money available for reconstruction. After that, the occasional beautification of Italian cities by Emperors had little or no connection with the settlement of colonists.

I append a few notes on various points. P. 13. The passage quoted from Vitruvius ii. 1 might have been more fully described; it supplies the strangest tale of town-planning on record. Dinocrates tendered to Alexander the Great a scheme for carving Mount Athos into the figure of a man; his left hand was to hold 'civitatis amplissimae moenia'; his right a 'patera,' which was to receive all the water flowing down the mountain and to pass it on to the sea. No wonder that Alexander the megalomaniac was delighted. P. 31. It is not unlikely that Timaeus was the authority of Diodorus for his statement about Thurii. If so, it carries us beyond the Roman age. P. 31. An interesting example of a city built, like Rhodes, with reference to water limits, is Amsterdam. The form so determined has been followed through centuries of expansion. It is said, as a result of the recent excavations, that when Ostia extended to the line of the coast, the direction of new streets was determined by the shore. P. 32. The passage of Strabo (p. 654), on which the view (rightly questioned here) is based that Hippodamus laid out Rhodes as well as Piraeus, is most vague. Not only is there no mention of the architect's name, but the authority is rumour (*ὡς φασίν*). P. 37. The earliest date here given for the appearance of an *ἀγοράνομος* in a Greek city is 350 B.C., but an inscription of Delos mentions one in 377. P. 47. One could wish for more information about some other partially explored ancient cities in Asia Minor, Perga for instance, which are known to have been constructed on rectangular plans. P. 48. The passage

of Diodorus (XX. 102) about the rebuilding of Sicily by Demetrius, though rather carelessly worded, does imply that the city still retained the form then given to it. Its history in later Roman times makes it improbable that it ever underwent reconstruction. The remark is true that the Republican Government is not likely to have spent money on Sicily; but Greek cities were sometimes reconstructed by aid of the Roman treasury in that age. Gabinius, at the instigation of Pompey, rebuilt more than one ruined Hellenic city in Syria. P. 74. Professor Haverfield regards a famous line attributed to Ennius by Festus (or rather Verrius Flaccus), in which 'Roma Quadrata' is mentioned, as 'clearly of much later date.' If the testimony of Verrius Flaccus is bad for this line, it must be equally bad for many others. It is true that the explanation of 'Roma Quadrata,' which is appended to the quotation, gives a meaning to the name which cannot have existed in the time of Ennius. It is said that 'Roma Quadrata' was the designation of a sort of 'mundus' which was situated 'ante aedem Apollinis.' I must, with Kornemann, regard this as a late 'Priestermärchen.' But the false interpretation does not necessarily discredit the authorship of the line. The theory that it was forged generations after Ennius, is intrinsically most improbable. P. 78. The current description of the arches often placed outside towns in the imperial period, as 'triumphal,' is unsuitable. Some of them were erected to celebrate triumphs, but this kind of arch became merely a conventional form in town architecture. An unsuccessful endeavour has been made to prove that these arches indicated 'coloniae.' P. 82. As to Aquileia, Professor Haverfield states that 'till its downfall, about 450 A.D., we hear no word of refoundation or wholesale rebuilding.' [The destruction by Attila occurred in 452.] The changes made by Maximinus Thrax in the city must have been considerable, for in an inscription (C.I.L. vol. v. 7989) he is called 'restitutor et conditor.' It had suffered severely at the hands of the Marcomanni. The extension of its

territory by Augustus need not, of course, indicate reconstruction. P. 106. As to Ammaedara, we have the testimony of Hyginus that its 'decumanus' and 'cardo,' as in a Roman camp,

ended in four gates and constituted the principal streets.

J. S. REID.

Cambridge.

THE TEXT OF FESTUS.

Sexti Pompeii Festi de Verborum Significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli Epitome. Thewrewkianis copiis usus edidit WALLACE M. LINDSAY. Teubner, 1913.

OF late years the great Leipsic firm has been issuing in a handy form certain texts which were often only accessible to the student in a library, yet are such as must lie on his own shelves if he is to realise their full value. I recently noticed in these columns the first volume of the *Corpus Agrimensorum*, edited by Thulin; before that we had the *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* of Buecheler, and Nonius edited in two volumes by Professor Lindsay. Now we have, from the same safe hand as the Nonius, the extant remains of the dictionary (if such it can be called) of Pompeius Festus. I write these lines in the throes of war-time, while our hopes of the power of learning and science to make war ever more and more impossible are being rudely shattered alike by German soldiers and German professors. But these two works of a British scholar, published by a German firm, will remain as evidence of an age of better international confidence.

The German firm made a good choice. Probably no scholar in Europe was better fitted to do this kind of work than Professor Lindsay, and to do it with unlimited devotion to the cause of true learning. He has been some twenty years at work on texts of this kind. In 1895 he edited, after the premature death of Mr. J. H. Onions, the work left by him on the text of Nonius; then came his edition of the same author for Messrs. Teubner; and since then he has edited Isidorus for the new Oxford texts. Like his friend Onions, he had come under the stimu-

lating influence of Henry Nettleship, the first scholar in this country to appreciate at their full value the Roman attempts at lexicography. It is quite needless to say that Professor Lindsay has executed his task with all his well-known accuracy and acuteness. Taking that for granted, I may be allowed to say a few words here about the work of Festus and its importance for all things Roman; for I notice that even in such a volume as the *Cambridge Companion to Latin Studies*, hardly anything is said of it.

When we talk of 'Festus,' we mean of course, the remains of an abridgement, made in the second century, of the great work of Verrius Flaccus *de Verborum Significatu*: the author of this abridgement was a *grammaticus* named Sextus Pompeius Festus, of whom we know little or nothing. Verrius Flaccus, who lived under Augustus and Tiberius, was tutor to the grandsons of the former, and may be considered the successor of Varro; he was no mere dry-as-dust, and his work was far more than a dictionary, so far at least as we can guess from the abridgment of it; his object was not only to preserve and explain words, but to rescue from oblivion the old rites, customs, and institutions, which they denoted. His book, if we had it complete, would be not only rich in value but extremely interesting: that may easily be guessed by anyone who will read straight through what remains of the compendium, as I have just done, after using it as a work of reference for more than thirty years. He will be astonished how much of our knowledge of Roman life and thought depends ultimately on this great work.

But of Verrius' work it cannot be said with strict truth that any part survives. Even the abridgment of it is mutilated: for the single extant MS.

of this (*Farnesianus*, in the Vatican), when first found near the end of the fifteenth century, was already in a melancholy condition. It began in the middle of letter M: up to that point all is lost of the dictionary, except what may have filtered through the works of other authors. Of the remaining portion three large fragments have also vanished, which were appropriated by a scholar named Pomponius Laetus soon after its discovery: but of these certain copies are extant, in particular one careful copy by Politian, which unluckily does not contain nearly all the missing part. And this is not all the melancholy story. The MS. was written in two columns on each page, and of these the outer ones have been ruined, either entirely or in part, by fire. Strange to say, however, the work of Festus was not destined to be thus rendered largely useless. At the end of the eighth century Paulus Diaconus, the author of a life of Gregory the Great, which has a good reputation, compiled for Charles the Great an epitome of the whole of Festus' compendium, compressing and shortening, but not re-writing, as we may gather from his own words in the introduction addressed to Charles. As we can compare what is left of Festus with this epitome, we know that in most cases the gist of the gloss is given by Paulus; on the other hand, only too many explanatory passages that to him seemed worthless, though they would be of the utmost interest to us, have been dropped out by him, and lost to us for ever.

What, then, is the work of an editor of Festus? Simply to elicit the writer's words, where doubtful or wanting, not

only from the one MS. and the copies of lost portions of it, but also from Paulus (whose own text is comparatively sound) and from conjecture based on knowledge. Not indeed to re-write, even where it might seem possible, the contents of the burnt pages: that indeed was done to a great extent by the last great editor, Otfried Müller, with the help of his predecessors of the sixteenth century, and here and there by Mommsen. Dr. Lindsay has wisely dropped out all this conjectural matter, so that the student who consults Festus is not biassed by the conjectures of others, but left to himself in using the mutilated parts—a far better plan. With all gratitude for the wonderful learning and ingenuity of these efforts of O. Müller, we are glad to find the text clear and clean once more. What we owe to Professor Lindsay, and also indeed to Thewrewk, the Hungarian scholar whose work passed into his hands, is the publication in a handy form of the combined text of Festus and Paulus, as established with the utmost care and pains by an expert of the highest repute, and the most unquestionable good sense and judgment.

Of the many further questions that arise in connection with Festus nothing need be said here; for the editor tells us that a second volume is to appear which will deal with other matters besides the text. We wish him good speed in this undertaking, nothing doubting, unless it be that a perverted German patriotism may refuse to work with a British editor.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

SHORT NOTICES

Vives on Education. A translation of the *De tradendis disciplinis* of Juan Luis Vives, with an Introduction by FOSTER WATSON. Cambridge University Press, 1913.

WHAT is, and what might be, is again called to our minds by reading this

book. How much wisdom and how much sound common sense can be found written on the subject of education, how much plain idiocy seen in the practice of it! Hardly less striking is it to see, that the great men are in accord as regards all main principles of educating. Vives, Erasmus, Vittorio

da Feltre, Comenius, all alike see that education means to give scope to the natural faculties of the child, in the natural way, and to guide them; and yet schools are and have been chiefly planned as though to repress, and to put formality in the place of life. And at this very day we see England, supposed to be the land of freedom, smothered by a network of examinations, which take account only of the mechanical and dead part of school work.

I have never conversed with any teacher, man or woman, who had any life or originality, without hearing that these devilish inventions choke all the life out of their work; and they are making inveterate the intellectual faults which Vives and his like warn us to avoid.

In this book the whole process of education is surveyed; but I shall leave aside the more general questions, including morals, to call attention to the remarks on teaching as an art. In Vives' day, the fight between the grammarian and the humanist had already begun. Vives, who regarded the learning of languages as a means to an end, or rather two ends, self-expression, and the use of what the language could teach, had no mercy upon the formalist. 'When grammar teachers spend their time in trifling amongst the boys, who drag them into ineptitude and puerilities, as if by contagion, they lose all seriousness and moderation. They are compelled to attend to the faults of the boys, which are innumerable . . . so that they are almost driven to anger and ferocity; and thrust down in that pounding-mill, their common sense becomes greatly diminished.' But his method should be inductive: use first, rules afterwards if necessary, and all based on the spoken word. He would have us learn Latin as we learnt our own language, by daily use. Advocates of reform will find good support in Vives.

He gives a detailed course of study, including mathematics and history; he was perhaps the first to insist on the importance of contemporary history for the school. But his course is not aimed at making grammarians, but citizens and men of the world. All through he

regards the school as helping and helped by the home; he was not faced by our modern problem, how to supply the place of the home. He even discusses the salaries of teachers, and wishes to see them paid by the State. The salary should be, he says, one that a good man will desire, and a bad man despise.

It is not possible to conclude without reminding readers that we owe this book to Mr. Foster Watson, who has given us a whole library of educational books of the first importance. Not the least attractive is a translation of Vives' own *Dialogues for Schools*, in which we have a vivid picture of the schoolboy's life in that day.

W. H. D. R.

Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres romains à propos de ceux d'Arles et d'Orange.
Par JULES FORMIGÉ. 1 vol. 4to.
Pp. 65. 5 plates + 13 text illustrations. Paris: Klincksieck (for the Imprimerie Nationale). 4 fr. 50.

M. FORMIGÉ starts from the theatres of Arles and Orange, which show much the same dimensions and styles of construction and which may (he thinks) have been built together at the time when the two *coloniae* were established—about B.C. 46. He proceeds to discuss a number of structural questions connected with Roman theatres in general, but especially illuminated by these two examples, such as the nature and uses of the 'orchestra,' the management of the *vela* and of the *aulaeum*, the distribution of seats and 'private boxes,' certain arrangements for scene-shifting, the value of 'acoustic jars,' and the like. We cannot here go into the details thus raised, but we may mention that M. Formigé seems inclined to fancy that a chorus figured in some at least of the Roman scenic performances, and that the laying out of the Roman theatre often shows traces of the presence of a chorus. The monograph is furnished with excellent plans and illustrations, and should be consulted by all who have to deal with Roman theatres, whether from the side of literature or of excavation.

F. H.

Caesaris et Hirti commentarii de bello Gallico. Ex recensione T. RICE HOLMES. 8vo. Pp. 249. Published by P. H. Lee Warner for the Medici Society. (Riccardi Press Books.) Boards, £1 1s. net.

THIS book can be cordially recommended to all who wish to read a luxurious edition of the commentaries on the Gallic War, undistracted by notes. It gives us the latest recension of our greatest authority on Caesar, in which there are nine or ten changes from the text edited by him for the Clarendon Press only six months ago (cf. *Class. Quart.* viii. 164). It is a pleasure to find that the Riccardi series is to include the masters of Latin prose as well as poets. No praise can be too high for the type, paper, and appearance of this beautiful volume.

W. W. How.

Merton College, Oxford.

The Principles of Greek Art. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt. D. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xvii+352. 112 illustrations (in the text). London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 10s. net.

THIS book is a new edition, with changed title, of the author's *Grammar of Greek Art*, published in 1905. The whole has been revised and enlarged, two new chapters having been added, one dealing with portraiture, the other with funerary art. It is thus a republication, with improvements, of a book that has supplied a very genuine want for the student of general Greek archaeology, and as such it is to be very heartily welcomed. It is, indeed, a very illuminating companion to the study of Greek art.

We welcome the two new chapters, and particularly sympathise with the emphasis Professor Gardner lays in the one on the importance of the worship of the dead in Greece and the debt of Rome to the Hellenistic age in the other. His insistence on the fundamental difference in principle between Minoan and Greek art is also welcome. To our mind the most illuminating chapter of all is the one that deals with the

NO. CCXLV. VOL. XXVIII.

relation of coins to history. This, from so eminent a numismatist as Professor Gardner, is naturally to be expected.

We venture to criticise in one of two instances. On p. 51 the strange implication seems to be made that the fact of a so-called temple at Paestum having an uneven number of columns in front may point to its being, as far as use goes, no temple at all. In chapter xviii. the art history of the Judgment of Paris is described, and one misses a reference to Miss Harrison's delightful treatment of it in her *Prolegomena*. On p. 259, note 2, the statement is made that the illustrations of the Blacas Krater are untrustworthy, as they were made before it was cleaned. No mention is made of its republication—presumably since the cleaning—in Furtwängler-Reichold-Hauser, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, third series, pl. 126. On p. 194 a krater at Bologna showing Theseus in the sea in search of Minos' ring is brought into close relation with Micon, and apparently dated at about that painter's epoch. It belongs in reality to the fourth century.

This brings us to the one serious criticism we have to make. Professor Gardner (p. 218 and throughout) still holds to the idea that Attic vase-painting practically died out after the fall of Athens, thus keeping to Milchöfer's antiquated dating. Surely this view has been quite disproved by Furtwängler, Nicole, and Hauser, and one may place Meidias fairly confidently at the beginning of the fourth century, and maintain that the Pronomos vase, for instance, and the late vases from the Crimea and the Cyrenaica show no signs of that decadence that used to be attributed to the Attic ceramic art of the fourth century. The idea, too, implied in the book that the South Italian wares took the place of the Attic, and were therefore after their beginnings an independent development is likewise false. All through the fourth century South Italian vases were profoundly influenced by the Attic.

Finally the presence of idealism in Greek art is dwelt on perhaps a little too insistently.

E. M. W. T.

Fordfield, Cambridge.

Die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie von JOHN BURNET. Zweite Ausgabe aus dem englischen übersetzt von ELSE SCHENKL. 8vo. Pp. vi + 243. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 10

STUDENTS of Greek philosophy owe an enormous debt to German scholarship; and translation has made its chief results generally accessible in this country. The corresponding export is more of a novelty; but Prof. Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy* was eminently worthy of a wider recognition. Frau Schenkl has made it her aim not merely to render the substance, but to preserve the impression of the author's style. An English reader can only say that, perhaps for that very reason, she has been successful in producing a version which is singularly easy to follow.

The translation is, subject to slight modifications, a close reproduction of the 1908 edition. In one respect it is an improvement, since references to Dielo's *Vorsokratiker* have been added throughout, though not with entire consistency. The details, so far as I have examined them, have been carefully transferred, but a necessary note has been dropped on p. 317, and the reference to Xanthus on p. 30. On p. 107 *παρέλκειν* as 'beim Rudern schwindeln' will startle some readers. The ordinary view is to be preferred. There is nothing to show that Xenophanes used the word *παρέλκειν*; and even if he did, the notion of the moon as a 'passenger' in the boat, while the sun does all the work, is too grotesque to be probable.

A. C. PEARSON.

Die Hellenistisch-roemische Kultur, dargestellt von FRITZ BAUMGARTEN, FRANZ POLAND, RICHARD WAGNER. (Mit 440 Abbildungen im Text, 5 bunten, 6 einfarbigen Tafeln, 4 Karten und Plaenen). Pp. xiv + 674. Teubner: Leipzig und Berlin, 1913.

THIS volume is similar in style and treatment to its predecessor, *Die Hellenistische Kultur*, of which the first and second editions were briefly noted in this journal (1906, p. 138; 1908, p. 193). A third edition, just issued, attests its

continued popularity or usefulness, and permits us to augur the like of its companion. Nor is it difficult to see why these books should have such a vogue in Germany and elsewhere. *Die Hellenistisch-roemische Kultur* is an inexpensive book; it is uncommonly well illustrated; it combines in an historical narrative materials otherwise accessible only pigeon-holed in cyclopaedias or distributed among many separate works; it is in general up to date.

It is also, however, of unequal merit. Poland's portion (State, Society, and Worship) lacks at once the lightness of touch of Baumgarten's sections (Art and Architecture), and the maturity and grasp of Wagner's (Literature, Religion, and Philosophy). This one of the authors seems to have been hardly equal to his task either in style or knowledge or breadth of view. In this last particular his defect may be illustrated by the fact that whereas Baumgarten ends his account of 'Art in the Roman Provinces,' with an interesting section entitled *Die christliche Antike*, and whereas Wagner relates the genesis and early development of Christian ideas and writings to pagan thought and letters, Poland fails to attach the institutions of the Roman Empire either to those of the Church or to those of Byzantium.

The outstanding feature of the work is that it combines the Hellenistic with the Roman period in an organic way. In this respect no other history of culture known to us is to be put in the same class with it.

W. S. FERGUSON.

American School, Athens.

Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek zu München. I. BYZANTINISCHE PAPYRI. I vol. 4to. Pp. x + 203. One portfolio of facsimiles. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 28.

WITH this volume begins the formal publication of one of the younger papyrus collections which have of late been multiplying so rapidly. The instalment here printed is part of a con-

siderable group of sixth-century documents found apparently at Elephantine and largely relating to the affairs of a family whose home was Syene. Other papyri belonging to the group have been acquired by the British Museum and are to be included in the next part of the Greek Catalogue; and occasionally, as might have been expected, fragments of the same document have found their way both to London and Munich. It is a pity that exchanges should not be arranged in such cases. On the whole, however, these texts are in excellent preservation. They consist for the most part of lengthy contracts, agreements for settlement of claims and for sales of house-property predominating. An interesting exception, which had already been utilized in J. Maspero's *Organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine*, refers to the matriculation of a recruit (No. 2); it is an acknowledgment by the officers of the *numerus* at Elephantine that they had received the certificate (*probatoria*) issued on the recruit's behalf by the *dux* of the Thebaid. The editing of the volume has been shared by Professors Wenger and Heisenberg, who have collaborated with most happy results, the latter being responsible for the transcriptions and translations, while the former's profound juristic knowledge finds scope in the commentaries. A special feature of this excellent publication is the accompanying portfolio of thirty-seven large facsimiles, in which the entire series of texts has been admirably reproduced.

A. S. H.

Thucydidis Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Aegyptiacis Servatae. Collegit FRIDERICUS FISCHER. 8vo. Pp. 75. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 3; in cloth, M. 4.20.

THIS slender 'dissertation' is useful, chiefly as providing a collection of all the fragments of Thucydides so far discovered in Egypt. The author's comments on them (written in clear, pointed Latin) amount to little more than indications of the few differences between the fragments and the received text, approvals of Dr. Hude or Mr. Stuart Jones according as the

course steered by each appears to him to deserve, and the remark that, while we are able now to recover some better readings than we had before, the History had obviously undergone a certain amount of corruption by the beginning of the second century A.D. Examples of this last are *τοῦ μὴ ἐκφεύγειν* (II. 4. 2), *τῇ δωδεκάτῃ* or rather *τῇ ιβ'* (II. 15. 4), and *μετεῖχον* (II. 16. 1), all occurring within a fairly short space. I think the author is right in retaining *τῶν χρημάτων τῆς προσόδου* (II. 13. 2) with the papyrus and Classen against Hude; but he should base this opinion not, as he partly does, on the evidence of the papyrus, but mainly on the ample, explanatory mood of the context. A more doubtful case is *τὰ ὅπλα παραδοῦναι* (IV. 37. 1) which, though clumsy and condemned by Krüger and Hude, is not offensive in language or sense, and appears in a piece of papyrus that has enabled us to make several noteworthy emendations of the codices. Another fragment (*Ox. Pap.* VI. 187), not available to Hude, gives us the important reading *δικαιουμένης* for *δικαιούμεν* ἡ (V. 105. 1).

On the whole it must be agreed that the Egyptian papyri have so far done but little for the question of interpolation in Thucydides, except to suggest that the mediaeval MSS. show the History in very much the same state as it was in the second century A.D.

The present volume has one serious defect. It fails to display the number of the book along with that of the chapter and section of each passage as it comes under discussion.

W. R. M. LAMB.

5, Cambridge Terrace, Kew.

De clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio adhibitis. SUSAN HELEN BALLOU. Pp. 1-106. Weimar, 1912.

Miss Ballou has had an interesting career. She is a B.A. of Chicago, where she gained a Fellowship in Latin literature. She has travelled extensively and spent some two years in Rome, where she worked on MSS. of the *Historia Augusta*. She went to Germany in 1910, and studied first at Göttingen and

subsequently at Giessen. She has now produced a substantial work, written in good Latin, upon the clausulae of Vopiscus, as a thesis for the degree of Ph.D. at Giessen. The fact that an American lady student at a German University has written a treatise on such a subject is a notable sign of the times.

It may be doubted whether Vopiscus deserves so much honour, also, if it is profitable to work in this way on a single author without reference to others. Miss Ballou's enthusiasm is however unmistakable and refreshing. She has examined minutely the chief MS. She attacks the standard edition—that of Peter—with boldness, and she makes emendations with a light heart.

There are indications that some of her views are taken from others without examination: thus she follows Caerer's theory of enclitic dissyllables without comment or discussion. Where her authorities differ, she is somewhat perplexed: thus on one occasion she pathetically remarks *Quid de hac re censeam incerta haereo* (p. 45). She has one noteworthy view which colours and, in the opinion of the present reviewer, vitiates her dissertation.

W. Meyer, after surveying a large number of authors belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries, pointed out the existence of what he calls a *cursus mixtus*. This is sometimes metrical as well as accentual, sometimes accentual only. Miss Ballou sets forth Meyer's theory fairly enough in Ch. IV, and recognises that a large number of clausulae in Vopiscus are purely accentual. She will not, however, acknowledge in him a *cursus mixtus*, but only *cursus mixti vestigia*. She, therefore, tries to explain most of his clausulae as metrical, even where the other hypothesis yields an easier solution. Thus, if Vopiscus sometimes neglects quantity, it is simple to consider *mānu pēfēcit* as an example of $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$, the *cursus planus*. Miss Ballou prefers to scan *mīltiārī mānū pēfēcit*, making *manu* enclitic (p. 55). But surely the shortening of the $-u$ in *mānu* is due to the stress accent on the first syllable. She wishes to write *vehiclo* for *vehiculo* in *Antiochiām vehiculo* (p. 27), a perfect specimen of the *cursus tardus*

($\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$): so she accents *media relinquemus* (p. 46), where we have a case of the *cursus velox* ($\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$). One result of her theory is that she is constantly meeting with the heroic clausula ($\sim \sim \sim \sim$), which she emends ruthlessly, though now and then she passes it without comment—e.g., *nōmēn hābērēt* (p. 43). Here again the accentual theory solves the difficulty at once. In the *cursus* it is indifferent whether the third syllable in $\sim \sim \sim \sim$ is long or short. Thus, while Terentianus Maurus assigns to the cretic a *sedes beata* just before the end, Gregory VIII. requires a dactyl in the same position. Miss Ballou's emendations, therefore, seem to be uncalled for. She herself admits (p. 41)

auctor quibusāam licentiis prosodiacis nisus est quibus clausulae primo aspectu heroicae in alias formas facile transformantur.

It would be interesting to know why she leaves a vowel short before *sc*, *sp*, *st*—e.g., *adcommodatiorē stylo* (p. 36), *faventē spero* (p. 61), *summā sciendī* (p. 98).

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

Companion to Roman History. By H. STUART JONES. With illustrations. Clarendon Press. 15s. net.

PUT briefly, this book contains the archaeology of Rome on a larger scale than is found in the well-known *Companion to Roman Studies*. The work is done with the utmost care for accuracy of detail, and accompanied by plans, cuts, and photographs. It is a scientific work, which the student of Roman life will find invaluable for his instruction, although it contains far more than is necessary for the ordinary reader of texts.

There are eight sections: Introductory, dealing with the origins, the land-system, town-building, roads; Architecture, with materials and methods of building, and all the typical structures; War, Religion, Production and Distribution, Money, Public Amusements, and Art.

The account of the pile-villages is excellent, and the author sees here the original plan which afterwards became

the camp: the camp, as we know, often became the mediaeval city in England and other provinces, which makes an interesting point for us moderns. The remarks on the principles of decoration (p. 62) are worth reading; and the curious may then examine the new Town Halls of our artistic age, and ask what principles are followed there: to the critical eye, modern ornaments seem to be stuck on anywhere with gum, whether they be Tudor beams an inch thick, or Renaissance still life. There is very little original in Roman architecture, but the fornix seems to be a Roman invention. The system of land-surveying and measurement, described by the *gromatici*, is also highly instructive, and may be new to many; but this, like all such technical subjects, illuminates the literature here and there. So with amphitheatres, *circi*, roads, drains, in all these topics the reader finds not only a clear and full account of the how and the why, but sidelights on ancient life.

In the sketch of Roman religion, if we have not the sympathetic touch that Mr. Warde Fowler gives, we have as before a thoroughly trustworthy account of the significant facts, illustrated from the remains of ancient art. For example, the account of marriage gives just what we want to know, and what we usually miss in the voluminous notes of commentators. So also in the rites of Mithras and other religious associations.

It is impossible to describe or to criticize such a mass of details in our space; but wherever I have examined the book with the inquiring mind of the learner, I have found what I wanted; everywhere, that is, except sometimes in the Index, which, full as it is, does not contain everything. It might have been worth while, for the sake of babes, to say what exactly were the names of the silver and copper coins most often found in collections: the names may be inferred, but they are not so clearly indicated as they might be. The prohibition of using anything but wood in the *pons publicus* is hardly likely to be due to the reason stated (p. 76). A bridge could be quite easily destroyed, even if it were put together with tenpenny nails.

W. H. D. R.

Morphologie Historique du Latin (Nouvelle Collection à l'Usage des Classes, XXXII.), par A. ERNOUT. Vol. I. Small 8vo. pp. xiii., 367. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck. Price 3 fr. 50 c.

FOR this Manual, a neighbouring volume of Niedermann's delightful little '*Phonétique Historique du Latin*,' a brief notice will suffice. M. Ernout tells anew the oft-told tale of Latin Linguistics, without, so far as we can see, adding much of his own. But he writes in an interesting style with all a Frenchman's *clarté*, and is free from the common fault of writers on this subject. They know Latin words only from the dictionary, not from the Latin authors. They find in their dictionary, let us say, '*bat, Interject.*' and proceed to search in other languages for affinities of this Latin Interjection, while, all the time, the word is a mere creation of Plautus' fancy (*Epid.* 95): '*At enim—bat enim! nihil est istuc.*' M. Ernout is not of the Bat-tribe; words do not, for him, exist only in dictionaries; he knows, and loves, Latin literature. But if he has leisure and opportunity for something more ambitious than this little manual, why does he spend his time in doing what has so often been done before?

W. M. LINDSAY.

Petronius: with an English translation by MICHAEL HESELTINE. Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*: with an English translation by W. H. D. ROUSE. Heinemann and the Macmillan Co.

THIS Translation is one of the now familiar Loeb series. It may, I think, safely be said, without any disparagement of the series as a whole, that this is far and away the best volume in Mr. Loeb's collection. I should myself be inclined to say that it is the best translation that I know of an ancient author. Every page is full of clever and telling phrases, and the whole is so wonderfully natural and spirited that one marvels how so much vitality can go hand in hand with such close and excellent scholarship.

I have noted, however, one bad

mistake and one bad habit: and, lest I should seem wholly uncritical in my admiration of Mr. Heseltine's book, I will mention both. At 132 Mr. Heseltine renders *perfricata fronte* by 'after rubbing my forehead'—which is meaningless in the context: the Latin means, here as elsewhere, 'behaving in a brazen fashion,' 'bluffing.' At 71 *sestertium trecentiens* is rendered by 'thirty millions.' This, as Mr. Heseltine of course knows, is something like 120 times too much; and an English reader will be hopelessly misled. This bad habit Mr. Heseltine carries with him to a good many other places where he has to deal with sums of money.

At 46 *si resiliert* means, surely, 'if he shows a reaction from this taste': cf. *resiluit* in Seneca, *N.O.* IV. a, l. 10. At 131 does not *peracto* go with *carmine*? At 41 could not Mr. Heseltine re-write the only clumsy sentence in his book—*dum haec loquimur e.q.s?* and might he not strike out an occasional 'damn my soul'—such phrases are mostly more striking than the Latin.

These are small blemishes in a translation which I could wish to see widely known (though I would not have all the world read Petronius). Mr. Heseltine's text is that of Buecheler, which combines immense merits with some obvious defects. I am tempted to make one critical suggestion. At 54 fin. Mr. Heseltine prints Scheffer's *vulneratum* for the *liberatum* of the MS.—a conjecture palaeographically little plausible. Is not the true correction *tuberatum*?

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. lx. S. Aureli Augustini Opera. Sect. viii., pars. I. Ed. C. F. VRBA ET J. ZYCHA. 8vo. Pp. xx+742. Vienna: Tempsky, 1913. M. 22.

PROFESSORS VRBA and Zycha have now published the first of the two sections of St. Augustine which they undertook. The second was published some

years ago, and they now give an index to both. This is Vrba's only contribution to the present edition; Zycha has been engaged upon it from the first. We are not told how the work has been divided between the editors. This volume contains five treatises, four dealing with the Pelagian controversy and the fifth, 'De Natura et Origine Animae,' with psychology, but with a view to the same debate. All were written between 412 and 420, and are businesslike arguments, the interest of which is chiefly technical. The MSS., as usual with Augustine, are many and good. In one case the editors do not venture to distribute them into families, and in all cases the cross-connections between the groups are numerous. The Index verborum et locutionum is long, but not so full on the grammatical side as in other volumes of the Corpus. It is not likely, however, that any locutions of interest are peculiar to these treatises. Some difficulty in the use of this edition will be caused by the fact that these volumes, containing only part of the anti-Pelagian treatises, are indexed by themselves, the remaining writings on this subject having been undertaken by other editors. But this concerns the subject-matter rather than the language of St. Augustine.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. lxii. S. Ambrosii opera, pars v., recensuit M. PETSCHENIG. 8vo. Pp. xii+539. Vienna: Tempsky, 1913. M. 16.

THE veteran Professor Petschenig, after many other labours for the Vienna Corpus, is now taking a share in the edition of St. Ambrose. His *Expositio Psalmi cxviii.* (119, according to the English notation) was written between 386 and 388, and is an eloquent, if verbose, application of its teaching to practice, combined with a great deal of allegorical interpretation. It was an edifying work and was popular with the monks, so that MSS. are numerous. Dr. Petschenig uses eight ranging between the ninth and eleventh centuries as the basis of his text; seven more have been collated and eleven inspected. But he frankly confesses that he has not been able to classify them in families. This

does not matter much; the text is in a sound state and the matter so obvious (in a good sense) that there is little difficulty. The only index is one of passages cited, which seems to be well done. The classical references are not very numerous and are rather obvious; the editor fails to identify one—'ante nos quidam interesse dixit inter docentes atque doctores.' The former are self-appointed. The Biblical text is interesting, and widely different from that of the predecessor, St. Hilary of Poitiers, to whom Ambrose was considerably indebted. Here we find an extraordinary omission. There is no reference to Hilary in the index or elsewhere. Yet without Hilary's work, written some fifty years earlier and itself based on Origen, that of Ambrose could not have taken the shape it did. Hilary is much briefer and has much more serious thought. He is theological rather than hortatory. Naturally enough, Ambrose displaced him in popular favour as an exegete, just as Augustine displaced him as a theologian. No evidence of the obscurity into which the greater man has fallen could be more impressive than Dr. Petschenig's neglect.

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Das rheinische Germanien in den antiken Inschriften. VON ALEXANDER RIESE. 1 Vol. 8vo. Pp. xiii + 479. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 18, unbound; M. 20, bound.

THE object of this book is to furnish a student of the history of the Rhineland under Roman rule with a survey of the epigraphic evidence bearing on his subject, put together in a handy form, and classified in such a manner as to make its use easy. Altogether the volume contains a collection of nearly five thousand inscriptions (not all printed in full), embracing not only texts found in Germany, but any from other parts of the Empire which can be thought to bear on the matter in hand. Thus the military inscriptions include not only those referring to the troops which were actually stationed on the Rhine,

but others, mentioning regiments originally raised in Germany and afterwards sent elsewhere, and under the names of the different Rhenish tribes we find any inscriptions of tribesmen which have been found outside Germany.

No principle of classification ever perfectly satisfies anyone except its maker, but that adopted by Dr. Riese seems adequate for most purposes, and is supported by an excellent index. Certainly those who have spent weary hours tracing inscriptions through the unindexed pages of Volume XIII. of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* will welcome a book which should in most cases enable them to get the desired information with a minimum of trouble, and Dr. Riese deserves our gratitude for his enterprise in filling in this respect such a long-felt want.

The inclusion of inscriptions from other parts of the Empire, while undoubtedly necessary to fulfil the object of the book, was more difficult to carry out on a consistent system, and the method adopted is not perhaps beyond criticism. In classifying the texts dealing with regiments originally raised in Germany and afterwards transferred to other provinces, it would surely have been sufficient to give references to the various 'diplomata' mentioning them without adding extracts from these documents. It is doubtful whether any information is derived from such a fragment as '... Antoninus Aug. Pius ... tr. pot. XI. ... alis ... quae appell. ... I Cannef. c. R. ... in Pannon. super. ...' which could not have been equally well given by a reference to the 'diploma' and its date following the name of the regiment.

Similarly it would have been better either to print in full such an inscription as *C.I.L.* III. 600, the well-known career of Lollianus, or merely to refer to it. The extract given is extraordinarily uninformative, and the concluding sentence dealing with Lollianus' road-making activities in Macedonia has in any case nothing whatever to do with his command in Mesopotamia of a detachment of troops who had once been in Germany, which seems to have been the reason why his inscription was included.

Still, in all such selections, a great many inscriptions must come on the border-line, and Dr. Riese could say with truth that omissions are a far more serious error than superfluities.

He has certainly given us a very useful and scholarly book for which we have every reason to feel grateful.

G. L. CHEESMAN.

New College, Oxford.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—Could you find space for three brief quotations from two of the earliest elegiac poets of Greece? The first is from Callinus (730 B.C.) and the others from Tyrtaeus (650 B.C.). Both authors wrote quite 2,500 years ago, yet they have a curious present interest. The exhortation of Callinus might be addressed to ourselves, and the words of Tyrtaeus describe with a sort of prophetic exactness the work of all those who are fighting under Sir John French.

(1)

Μέχρις τευ κατάκεισθε; κότ' ἄλκιμον ἔχετε θυμόν,
ὦ νέοι; οὐδ' αἰδέισθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας
ὥδε λίην μεθιέντες; ἐν εἰρήνῃ δὲ δοκεῖτε
ῆσθαι· ἀπὸρ πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει.

2. ἀμφ. τοῖς ἀποίκους τοῖς πόντου πέραν
αἰνίττεται. Schol. τὰ νεώτερα ἔθνη. R. K.

(2)

Ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ
ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβάς ἐν προμάχοισι μένη
νωλεμέως, αἰσχροῦς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος.
αἶψα δὲ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν ἔτρεψε φύλαγγας
τρηχέας, σπουδῇ δ' ἔσχεθε κύμα μάχης.

2. διαβάς, 'sc. La Manche' doct^{mus} Poincaré.
Alii aliter.

6. τρηχέας, epitheton notans feritatem incredibilem (Editores Belgici).

(3)

Οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπώλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίγνεται ἀθάνατος,
ὄντων ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θυοῦρος Ἀρης ὀλέσῃ.

T. L. A.

11, Clyde Road, West Didsbury,
Manchester.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Appleton (R. B.) *Fabulae, virginibus puerisque aut narrandae aut recitandae.* 7½" x 5". Pp. x+180. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1914. Cloth, 2s.

Arnold (W. T.) *The Roman System of Provincial Administration.* Third edition, revised by E. S. Bouchier. 7½" x 5". Pp. x+284. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.

De Ducibus. Selections from Cornelius Nepos. By W. G. Butler. 6¼" x 4½". Pp. viii+124. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. 1s. 6d.

Murray (G.) *Hamlet and Orestes: a Study*

in Traditional Types (Annual Shakespeare Lecture). 9¼" x 6¼". Pp. 26. Oxford: University Press, 1914. 1s. net.

Noctes Latinae. By W. Madeley. Macmillan's Elementary Classics. 6" x 4". Pp. vi+166. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 1s. 6d.

Plautus. Five plays translated into English verse by Sir R. A. Allison. 9" x 6". Pp. xxi+318. London: A. L. Humphreys, 1914. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Sharp (D. S.) *Epictetus and the New Testament.* 7¼" x 5". Pp. xii+158. London: C. H. Kelly, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.